114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

Speaker Madigan: "The regular Session shall come to order. Is there leave to use the Attendance Roll Call of the First Special Session for this Session? Leave is granted. The Chair recognizes Mr. Tryon."

Tryon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to rise to a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Madigan: "State your point."

"It came to my attention yesterday, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that Representative Molaro was here in attendance and was criticizing me for not being in attendance because his little league baseball team from his district was going to play the Crystal Lake And he was convinced that I wasn't here American League. because I was at home hiding my head in the sand. have always admired Representative Molaro for his ability to articulate vernacular B.S. in a manner that some fine artists might weave a tapestry. But as usual, he did not do his research fully and get the facts straight. And I am proud to tell you today that the Crystal Lake American Little League team is the championship in Illinois this year beating Representative Molaro's team. And my good seatmate, Representative Sacia, came to my rescue by offering five (5) pounds of the world's best cheese that's manufactured in Stoton (sic-Stockton) Illinois, and if you haven't had their cheese I can tell you it's excellent cheese that will be provided to the House by Representative Molaro. As you can see, he's not here today. So he is hiding his head in the sand or licking his wounds, but I do understand his team played valiantly and

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

- sportsmanship and I'm glad to say it was a good game and Crystal Lake won. Thank you."
- Speaker Madigan: "On the order of... Mr. Clerk, Committee Reports."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Rules Committee. Representative Barbra Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following legislative measures and/or Joint Action Motions were referred, action taken on August 09, 2007, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'approved for floor consideration' is Amendment #2 to House #4 to 3860 and Amendment Senate Representative Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on Executive, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on August 09, 2007, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'recommends be adopted' is Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 997; 'do pass as amended Short Debate' is Senate Bill 48."
- Speaker Madigan: "On the Order of the Supplemental Calendar #1, there appears Senate Bill 48. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of that Bill?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 48, a Bill for an Act concerning schools. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, put the Bill on the Order of Third Reading. On page 5 of the Calendar on the Order of House Bills-Second Reading, there appears House Bill 3860. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of that Bill?"

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 3860 has been read a second time, previously. No committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Hannig, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hannig on the Amendment."
- Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

 In order to save some time I would suggest we could adopt the Amendment and then debate it on Third."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Put the Bill on the Order of Third Reading and read the Bill for a third time."
 - Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 3860, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hannig on the Bill"
- Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

 This is a twelve-month..."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hannig, would you use the microphone at Mr. Rita's chair?"
- Hannig: "All right. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This is a twelve-month spending plan that will ensure that our state employees, who have come to their station every day of this crisis, will be paid in full. It provides that those vendors, who have continued to provide us with the goods and services that we need to make State Government operate, that they will be paid in full. And it

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

would give the Comptroller at least an opportunity to begin the process of sending out general state aid payments. budget does much more than that, but I think it's important to start with that. Because we stand here today, as we all know in August, without a budget. So this is a negotiated budget, all four (4) caucuses participated, all four (4) caucuses had input into this budget. And while certainly not all caucuses would say that they agreed with everything that's in this budget, there is a general agreement that it's time that we pass this budget. Some of the highlights in this budget, of course, I would begin with our K-12 spending. This is probably the most common thread that comes throughout... that we... that's woven throughout the State of Illinois an unites us all as supporters of education. The increase in general state aid is six hundred... roughly six hundred million dollars (\$600,000,000). The foundation would increase by four hundred dollars (\$400), and I'm advised that that's the biggest increase in the history of the foundation level. The categoricals would be changed in two ways. First of all, we would increase the base that we reimburse our school districts for special ed teachers. And we'd fully fund the categorical grants at 100 percent. something that I think we all have worked very hard to do over the last few years and certainly today, I'm happy to say that we're able to provide funding to do that. is money in the budget for other items that are important. For example, in higher ed there's a 2 percent increase for our universities. There's some additional money for

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

community colleges. The MAP program will be continued at the level that we funded it last year at that expanded level. Human Services will see increases as well. This is an important budget because it will fund the pension systems fully. It does a number of things that I think we all would agree on. And I would certainly be happy to answer any questions, but I would certainly urge your 'yes' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Eddy."

Eddy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Eddy: "Representative, just to kind of break down some of the other items that are contained in this budget that many of the Members in here over the years have had a particular interest in. Maybe we could highlight a couple because I think they're noteworthy. There is, as I understand it, funding in this budget for gifted education?"

Hannig: "That's correct, five million (5,000,000)."

Eddy: "Five million dollars (5,000,000) for gifted education which was a program four (4) years ago, I believe, that was folded in. And many of the Members on both sides have discussed and, in fact, we passed legislation that would allow for gifted education programs to... to be available to school children in Illinois, but we did not fund that this line item."

Hannig: "That's correct."

Eddy: "So this budget contains money for gifted education for the first time in several years. Also, contained in this budget, to my understanding, is money that would allow the

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

State Board of Education to implement growth model assessment?"

Hannig: "That's correct."

Eddy: "Now, not very long ago, the House passed a Resolution supporting growth model as a preferred alternative to the type of assessment we now use for the national... the No Child Left Behind Act. I think everybody would agree that it's a good way to measure the progress of a child. However, there was nothing in Illinois that allowed us to implement growth model here so that we could apply at the federal level to use that. These funds will allow that process to begin?"

Hannig: "That's correct."

Eddy: "And I think, again, it's something everyone in here supported. Early childhood education, which has been something, I think, on both sides of the aisle since the 1980s and I want to recognize Majority Leader Currie for her involvement early on in early childhood education. But early childhood education is also served in this budget and there is a line item, I believe, for twenty-five million dollars (\$25,000,000) in early childhood education?"

Hannig: "Yes, that's correct, Representative, an increase of twenty-five million (25,000,000)."

Eddy: "So those... those who support early childhood education have something in this budget. We also had discussions this year about the importance of truant alternatives and keeping funding for truant alternatives in this budget. And I believe that there is a funding increase of about two million dollars (\$2,000,000) for truant alternatives?"

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

Hannig: "That's correct."

Eddy: "Arts and foreign language has an increase in this budget. Blind and dyslexic has an increase in this budget. There are also some interesting and innovative creative new programs in this budget that allows intervention in school districts, one of the Governor's initiatives for targeted interventions to turn around failing schools in Chicago. I believe there is about four million dollars (\$4,000,000) in this budget for that item."

Hannig: "Yes, Representative, you're correct."

Eddy: "And I... I could cite more. I think my point is that this budget reflects... this budget reflects the priorities of a number of Members and it also reflects the priorities of the Governor. In fact... in fact, the mentoring and induction portion of this budget has substantial money to allow for principals, superintendents, and teachers to begin meaningful mentoring and induction programs."

Hannig: "That's correct."

Eddy: "All of these, I think, are agreed on by most everyone on... in the General Assembly. Now, there are those... and I heard it described as woefully inadequate. I think I read woefully inadequate. Now, I'm not sure what we're comparing it to, but if I look at the foundation level increases of the last four (4) years under this Governor, the first year was two-fifty (250), the next year was one-fifty-four (154), then we had a couple hundred dollars (\$200). Last year, it was one hundred and seventy-one dollars (\$171) on the foundation level. So four hundred dollars (\$400) on the foundation level is woefully

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

inadequate. I'm not sure how we would describe the success of the previous four (4) years that this Governor has presented as a budget for education. If this is inadequate, what were those? iust one And correction, and I think I was the one that provide the information about this being the largest increase, but the is, back in 1998, '99 when we first did recommended levels under Edgar, there was about a thousand dollar (\$1,000) increase, but that was the beginning of this process. But since that time, this is the largest single increase. Representative, just very quickly, to the Bill, the education portion of the Bill. I understand that there will be people who think that we aren't addressing some of the critical needs in education, that this was the year that we needed a billion and a half dollars (\$1,500,000,000) that we were going to do property tax relief. But Ladies and Gentlemen, this is time in the school budget cycle that we need to act. We need to act today; we need to pass this budget so that our schools know what their funding level will be at for this fiscal year. When they open the doors, they know what programs they can provide children and they know that they will be able to write the checks to the teachers across the state to serve the school children. We can always want more and I'm a supporter of some of those fundamental changes that we're talking about. However today, I'm a supporter of this budget because it's time... it's time that we guarantee, not to our state workers, but to the two (2,000,000) school children of the State of Illinois that

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

they will open their schools and they will be served. And they're going to be served by a very good budget for education. And I would urge everyone in here to vote for this for the sake of school children across the state and opening those schools in a timely fashion."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Mulligan."

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Representative yield?'

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Mulligan: "Representative Hannig, I just want to go over the Human Service budget a little bit with you. My understanding is that... I'm trying to grab my many notes here. The Department of Health Care and Family Services is being funded at the Governor's introduced level with several cost-saving initiatives."

Hannig: "Yes, that's correct."

Mulligan: "The only difference would be you added in money to fully fund the retirement, so actually they're getting more."

Hannig: "Yes, I think that the Governor when he introduced his budget, it was predicated on that we sell the lottery and that we do pension obligation bonds and so we will fully fund the pensions, and that's why they were not reflected, I think, in the initial introduction. We also have some money in here for nursing homes that were not in the Governor's original proposal."

Mulligan: "My understanding in working on this, particularly with Representative Feigenholtz and your staff and our staff, who have done a really good job and some of the

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

Members on our side, our committee, Representative Coulson, Representative Munson. I think we've done a really good job considering the great expectations that this Governor led people to believe with revenue that never materialized. So, I think everybody tried really hard. Under this budget, though, I have one concern. The concern is about the fact that the Governor has not signed the supplemental and we're going to have a problem paying the hospital tax money out. He hasn't signed that. I understand the FY08 money is in here, but we're reaching a point where the FY07 money is going to be a problem."

- Hannig: "I would only say that I think all of us would urge the Governor to sign that proposal as quickly as possible."
- Mulligan: "I think he's really hurting, particularly the poorer hospitals around the state by not signing it. They've also paid a great deal out of the Medicaid lines already so there might be a cash flow problem, is my understanding?"
- Hannig: "Representative, I agree with what you're saying. We passed a supplemental and we think we've dealt with the '07 problem and we're trying to deal with the '08 problem here."
- Mulligan: "All right. Going on to the Department of Human Services. We made some good additions there, I thought, there will be a 2.5 percent COLA for the DD providers?"

Hannig: "Yes."

Mulligan: "There will be a 3 percent COLA for DASA providers, who haven't had a COLA for what, six (6) or seven (7) years, now?"

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

- Hannig: "Yes, it's... I don't know what the time frame is, but there is an increase, yes."
- Mulligan: "All right. There's also some increase that target to the mental health providers in our area. In three (3) areas the 2.5 million (2,500,000) increase for safety net providers, 2.5 million (2,500,000) increase for contact amount for mental health providers, and three million (3,000,000) for providers who are going over contract amounts, so that there is some help and a big safety net for the questions that have come up during this Session in mental health."
- Hannig: "That's correct, Representative, those are all
 included."
- Mulligan: "All right. And we're hopeful the Department will continue to listen to the concerns there and fund what we ask them to fund. Also, there is five million new dollars (\$5,000,000) for the autism program?"
- Hannig: "I'm advised that it's actually seven and a half
 million (7,500,000)."
- Mulligan: "Okay, that's good. You're annualizing the COLA for early intervention domestic violence centers for independence living which is amounting to 8.1 million dollars (\$8,100,000)?"
- Hannig: "Yes, Representative."
- Mulligan: "Actually you're annualizing COLA that the Governor has also not signed in the supplemental Bill, so they should have gotten it originally, which would be nice if he would sign that supplemental."

Hannig: "That's correct."

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

Mulligan: "You're allocating funding for community mental health from the lock box money and we're also putting money into the... a million dollars (\$1,000,000) into the children's mental health partnership?"

Hannig: "Yes, Representative, those are all correct statements."

Mulligan: "There's additional money going into emergency food and shelter in that area where they've been cut in the past by the Governor's level. We've put in another five hundred thousand dollars (\$500,000) to try and catch them up?"

Hannig: "Yes, Representative."

Mulligan: "There's new money for school-based clinics?"

Hannig: "Yes."

Mulligan: "Three million dollars (\$3,000,000)?"

Hannig: "That's correct."

Mulligan: "There's new money for assistive technology. It's two hundred and fifty thousand dollars (\$250,000) put in there?"

Hannig: "Yes, it's the same as we had last year. I think it was reduced from... we put it in last year. The Governor took it out from his introduced budget and we've restored it."

Mulligan: "There's additional two million (2,000,000) funding to support assets to independence program?"

Hannig: "Yes, Representative."

Mulligan: "The Lincoln Development Center, there's nine hundred and ninety thousand (990,000) for that? That's to sustain the current funding?"

Hannig: "This is... the nine... I'm advised the nine-ninety (990) is so that they can continue the operations that are there.

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

It's not for an expansion, but to continue the services that they currently provide, so... which isn't a whole lot, but it would keep it at the level that it is."

Mulligan: "All right. Let's move down to the Department Of Veterans' Affairs. Actually, the General Assembly has raised the amount of money by adding the money to meet the pension obligations."

Hannig: "Yes, that's correct."

Mulligan: "There's seven hundred and fifty thousand (750,000) in new funding to support the program for PTSD, out-patient counseling?"

Hannig: "Yes, Representative."

Mulligan: "There's 2.2 million (2,200,000) to support an additional eighty (80) beds at the LaSalle Veterans' home."

Hannig: "Yes, the eighty (80) beds are in."

Mulligan: "And there's a new homeless veterans' programs at Manteno?"

Hannig: "Yes, Representative, that's a part of this budget."

Mulligan: "Let's move on the Department of Children and Family Services. You're funding that at the Governor's introduced level and you're adding an additional amount to meet the pension obligations. Is that correct?"

Hannig: "Yes, and I think as an overview for all of this Representative, I forgot to say it in my introduction, but there was a late agreement amongst the Leaders to add some additional funding for AFSCME officials, for AFSCME employees throughout... throughout the various agencies in the State of Illinois including this one. So that would be in there as well."

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

- Mulligan: "So, hopefully, they will actually hire the people, particularly downstate, where they've been having a problem."
- Hannig: "Yes. So for example, we estimate that for Children and Family Services this would be about forty-eight (48) positions."
- Mulligan: "All right. So that... that should help if they actually allow them to hire the positions that we've put in."

Hannig: "Yes, I would agree."

Mulligan: "All right. And the additional amount that was in the Governor's budget is not really an additional amount for DCFS; it's to cover the amount that they're losing in federal funding?"

Hannig: "Yes, that's correct."

- Mulligan: "All right. Let's move on to the Department of Aging. The Department of Aging, the budget was used... the provisions in the final budget contain a thirty-two million (32,000,000) increase compared to the FY07 budget for the Community Care Program. Although, this does represent a twenty-five million (25,000,000) decrease from the Governor's introduced budget."
- Hannig: "That's correct, but I'm advised that the agency has advised us that they would not cut... Charles Johnson advised us that they would not cut services."
- Mulligan: "There will be an addition two million (2,000,000) for the home delivered meals program?"

Hannig: "Yes."

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

Mulligan: "An additional one million (1,000,000) in elder abuse and neglect to cover projected growth in the program."

Hannig: "Yes, Representative."

Mulligan: "All right. Let's go back to the Community Care Program. In speaking of people from AARP and the director, we have some concerns that that money may be expended by the end of May. So, I hope that we will be watchful over it and hope that their concerns are wrong, but they're certainly worried about whether the policy that we're implementing would reduce the amount of care of services provided to the number of clients... or the number of clients served. So, we're hoping that Comprehensive Care Case Coordination Management Services will be fully implemented. And we're hoping that the department will come to us in enough time if they see the line being expended to soon, so that the General Assembly can act either in Veto Session, which will be upon us shortly, unfortunately, or in January."

Hannig: "We share your concerns and will work with you, Representative."

Mulligan: "All right. Because we were very concerned, we were trying to add the twenty-five million (25,000,000) back in and that did not happen. Let's move on to the Department of Public Health. That budget also received the increase for the pensions?"

Hannig: "That's correct."

Mulligan: "There was a hundred and seventy-five million (175,000,000) added for breast and cervical cancer screenings?"

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

Hannig: "It's actually 1.75 million (1,750,000)."

Mulligan: "There was money to add to the perinatal for high risk infants and mothers, 1.5 million (1,500,000), which adds to their program?"

Hannig: "Yes, that's correct."

Mulligan: "It is our understanding that a half a million dollars (\$500,000) of that is going to establish the Birth Defect Registry?"

Hannig: "Yes, that's our understanding, as well."

Mulligan: "All right. That's really important. We're missing out on some federal programs because we're not that and it's a good way to track, particularly, our problems with autism and other birth defects, would be very good to have that. There's an additional million dollars (\$1,000,000) added to access-to-care?"

Hannig: "Yes, that's correct."

Mulligan: "Although, we are concerned that Cook County Hospital has cut off the money to collar counties and we're hoping that there will be some money somewhere for that, too, because they're no longer returning those services. The University of Chicago is receiving 2.5 million dollars (\$2,500,000) for juvenile diabetes research?"

Hannig: "Yes, that's correct."

Mulligan: "Rural downstate for the medical program is receiving an additional seven hundred thousand dollars (\$700,000)."

Hannig: "Yes, Representative, that's correct."

Mulligan: "I'd also like to thank Representative Bellock for reminding us to get that in; she served on that task force.

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

There are additional grants to local health departments, five million dollars (\$5,000,000)?"

Hannig: "Yes."

Mulligan: "There is expansion to the community health center of three million dollars (\$3,000,000)?

Hannig: "Yes, that's correct."

Mulligan: "There's new money into a program for suicide prevention that's three hundred and fifty million dollars (\$350,000,000)... I mean three hundred and fifty thousand dollars (\$350,000)?"

Hannig: "Yes, three hundred and fifty thousand (350,000) is correct."

Mulligan: "And there is money for the spinal cord injury research, three hundred and fifty thousand dollars (\$350,000)."

Hannig: "Okay, yes, that's correct?"

Mulligan: "We've also put money in for the electronic medical records, particularly at the request of the community health centers and Illinois Primary Health Care. They need that to track their clients."

Hannig: "Yes, Representative, that's correct."

Mulligan: "There's a hundred and eighty thousand dollars (\$180,000) in there for Adoption Registry?"

Hannig: "Yes, that's correct."

Mulligan: "And a hundred and fifty thousand dollars (\$150,000) for the hearing program?"

Hannig: "Yes, Representative, that's correct."

Mulligan: "Let's move on to guardianship and advocacy. They also have an increase covering pensions and also there's

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

additional GRF requested for costs related to and in support of social services shared with service centers?"

Hannig: "Yes, Representative, that's correct."

Mulligan: "Human Rights and Department of Human Rights, both got increase covering pensions?"

Hannig: "Yes."

Mulligan: "And Department of Human Rights got 1.5 million (1,500,000) in new GRF for expenses relating to investigation in processing of Human Rights cases so they keep on target and don't have a backlog?"

Hannig: "Yes, we believe that's correct, Representative."

Mulligan: "I think that's most all of them where there's any significant change or difference. We're hopeful that certainly the public will appreciate the efforts that were made without raising taxes. Considering what the Governor did in creating expectations, moving programs around and disturbing the general budgets, it was a feat to put them back together in order to accommodate some COLAs, accommodate some new employees and accommodate some new programs, keep funding regular, and fund pensions. So we'd like to thank our staff, particularly both Democrats and our Republican staff, who have worked around the clock with me, Members of the Human Service Approp Committee, in particularly Representative Feigenholtz."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Real briefly, I know that this is probably going to pass the… today. But I just think that some points need to be made. And when I sit here and I think and reflect about this budget, where we've

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

been, how we've gotten here, two and a half months into an there been overtime Session. Have mistakes Probably. Have people not been reasonable on some aspects on all sides of this? Probably. But the bottom line is this isn't a referendum on someone else, this is a referendum on us. We're the ones that are casting this vote, a 'yes' or 'no' vote on this budget. This isn't a referendum on the Senate, it isn't a referendum on the Governor. It's a referendum on what are we voting for the State of Illinois, and whether these two and a half months sitting here have been well spent. Now let me just tell you what... the way I see this budget. First of all, how do you spend two billion dollars (\$2,000,000,000) more with no increase in revenue? You do it by cooking the books, you do it by not having a balanced budget, you do it by increasing the revenue estimates, you do it by taking money away from the people who are going to receive tax refunds and you call it a balanced budget. And I didn't run for office... and some of the people I read in Capitol Fax and elsewhere, some of my good friends on the other side of the aisle, I see that they're not going to run again. And you sit down and you reflect, why did you run for office? Why aren't you running again? Why are we running? Why am I going to run again? I didn't run for office in order to not provide health care for people. I didn't run for office and not... in order to not provide a capital Bill to put people to work. I didn't run for office in order to make false promises to education that we hold so dear. Money that's not going to be able to go to our school

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

district because this budget isn't balanced, it doesn't add Sometimes you wonder... I don't know... when you look at this budget, I don't know if I should laugh or cry. I laugh because it's so out of whack? Because... a billion dollars (\$1,000,000,000) out of whack. Or should we cry because twenty-five million dollars (\$25,000,000) is going to affect forty-six thousand (46,000) seniors throughout Illinois who are not going to be able to stay in their own homes and will have to be going into institutions? Should I cry because twenty million (20,000,000) in proposed early childhood development funds would eliminate at ... will be cut to eliminate access to preschool? Should we be upset because we are going to eliminate access to full-day kindergarten to seventy-four hundred (7,400) children? Should I be upset, I think I should, that twenty-five million dollars (\$25,000,000) will be eliminated for rate increases for early childhood teachers? And I certainly should be upset because sixty-seven million (67,000,000) in Medicaid is going to be impacted and reduced and will not be able to serve families because it's underfunded. And I certainly am upset because we're making false promises to the school districts because the billion dollar (\$1,000,000,000) hole means states will run out of money to fund appropriations and education budget. Now, we can sit here and we can talk about, oh my goodness, the sky is falling. There's a thirty-day budget we could pass today to alleviate that problem. We could sit here and we could stop all name calling, and we can go in a room and we can work together to pass a capital budget that's going to put

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

seven hundred (700) people to work in the State of Illinois, address the issues, like the bridge construction issue in Illinois, where bridges are failing us and we don't want to have a repeat of Minnesota. We could address the issue of schools that are falling down around our children. We need a new school program. We could address the issue of public universities, but all the Leaders must meet together to get a capital Bill. And we have a way to pay for it that is reasonable. We should all work towards that goal. Who's for this Bill? Who is for this Bill? Well, we say the caucus Members, who sat down, and the Leaders are for the Bill. But I can tell you who's not for the Bill. On our side of the aisle, who's not for the Bill, organized labor... organized labor, the AFL-CIO, the laborers, the electricians, the Teamsters, the IFT, IEA, they are not for this Bill. There's not enough money in this Bill to make sure education's going to get funded, no money for health care. There's no money for jobs and infrastructure in this state. So, this vote is a referendum on us, it's not a referendum on the Governor, it's not a referendum on the Senate. It's a referendum on why are we here. Why are we running again, and why do we... what do we want to do as people in this General Assembly? We can do this, we can provide money for health care, we can provide money for education and get a needed capital Bill if we put this bickering aside, if we put these types of budgets aside that are going to hurt people and we sit down and get to work. We can do it, let's still work together to do it. This budget... this budget will never be

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

law. It will not be law. It hurts too many people, it can't be law. It's a phony budget put together on a shoestring. We can do it the right way, let's do it together and fulfill the mandate of the people who sent us here."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Black: "Representative, this is one thousand three hundred and ninety-five (1,395) page Bill. I started to go through it on my system at about 9:30 this morning and I'm up to, I don't know, a hundred and eighty (180) pages or something like that. I was trying to add up all the travel costs and I couldn't... I'm up to over five million (5,000,000). How much money in this budget is set aside for travel for various agencies?"

Hannig: "I don't have that total, Representative, I'm sorry."

Black: "Way too much. We should line item out every travel budget for one (1) year when we're in this kind of shape.

Another question that I ran across when I looked at this, how long have we used General Revenue Funds to supplement the Chicago Teachers Pension System?"

Hannig: "I don't know the exact date, Representative. I know we've done it for a number of years that I've been here."

Black: "It's not been that long. And I remember how it happened. We gave them permission to use funds to supplement health insurance and the way, as I understand it, the way their pension system is formulated, when they

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

- fall below the 90 percent funding level then they can come to the State General Revenue Fund to get them back to the 90 percent funding level."
- Hannig: "I think it's... that get the same deal, I think, as all the pensions."
- Black: "I don't think it's always been that way, it's been in the last few years."
- Hannig: "That point, you're correct, Representative. It's not always been that way."
- Black: "Right. On page 35 of the budget, the Chicago City College... the Community College System of Chicago gets fifteen million dollars (\$15,000,000) in operating money. Is this just the third year for that money?"
- Hannig: "It could be the third, maybe the fourth, but you're in the neighborhood, Representative."
- Black: "I... I can't get a one dollar (\$1.00) increase, not one dollar (\$1.00) in the community college equalization grant formula, but the City Colleges of Chicago can get fifteen million dollars (\$15,000,000) for 'operating' expenses. That's about the third year they've gotten it. That just kind of really boils my blood."
- Hannig: "So, Representative, from your caucus a request was inserted into the budget for about seven... seven million dollars (\$7,000,000) for the community colleges for their..."
- Black: "That's credit hour grants, and I appreciate that addition that was taken out for the veterans' grants. And guess where most of the money for veterans' tuition reimbursement from community college, guess where most of that goes? Most of that goes to Chicago."

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

Hannig: "So, I think the veterans' money is in as well,

Representative."

Black: "I understand that."

Hannig: "Okay."

Black: "But not one penny more for the equalization grant formula which helps those community colleges in smaller districts make up for EAV loss. Flat lined, same money that they got last year, not one penny more."

Hannig: "I think most of our community colleges, in downstate at least, will get more because of the veterans' grants and because of some of the other grants that we've put in. The seven million (7,000,000) will be distributed to all the community colleges."

Black: "I understand. I worked ten (10) years in community college. And I appreciate the fact the seven million (7,000,000) was put back in for credit hour grants. But I'm really disappointed, and I know my caucus Representatives tried very hard to get money back in them in the equalization formula and it just didn't happen. Let me ask you about IDOT aeronautics. Is there any new money in the budget… is there any money in the budget for any new airplanes for Air Illinois?"

Hannig: "I'm not aware that we're purchasing any new planes.

And typically, they don't line those out into the budget."

Black: "All right. Yeah, for good reason. Let me ask you another question. You know, the plane that the Governor uses has gotten so much wear and tear, I'm sure we're going to have to replace it sooner or later. Can you... can you or you staff tell me... and it's hidden, it's hidden all over

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

the budget, and it's always been this way. What is the total amount of money we spend for operations, personnel, and maintenance of state-owned aircraft?"

Hannig: "Representative, we don't have it at our fingertips and
 our staff will try to find it."

"I would love to know that. I try to find it; it's hidden all over the budget. If people knew how much money we spend to operate Air Illinois to ferry a bunch of state officeholders and bureaucrats back and forth to Chicago, I think they'd have indigestion. We subsidize Amtrak to the tune of millions of dollars, why don't they take the train? God forbid they drive. Hell no, they've got to fly on a six million dollar (\$6,000,000) King Air. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, somebody awhile ago said we were making false promises to education, false promises to education is when you read a press release that any school that needs to borrow a hundred and seventy-five million dollars (\$175,000,000) or any portion thereof, just contact the Governor. That's a false promise. The Illinois Finance Authority doesn't even have a hundred and seventyfive million dollars (\$175,000,000). The have forty-eight (48,000,000) million in assets, and that's bond money. You can't spend bond money for operation expenses. Even a freshman learns that. And then last night I get to see the Governor calling the Comptroller some kind of weak-kneed sister because he wouldn't write the payroll checks. good for the Comptroller. At least we've got one person in this administration who's mature enough and has read the Constitution and understands that without a budget you

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

can't write checks. But the Governor say's, 'Oh, don't worry about that. There's money in the bank. Write the checks.' For crying out loud, Governor, you told us for years you didn't know that there was a law library at I'm beginning to believe it. But at least Pepperdine. read the Illinois Constitution. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in what probably is my last debate on a budget, let me say this. This process is wrong. It does not serve us well; it does not serve our constituents well; it doesn't serve the media well. One thousand, three hundred and ninety-five (1,395) pages, our staff got this Bill at 10 p.m. last night. I see it on my computer at about 9:15 a.m. this morning. The press hasn't had a copy, the public can't download it in time to read it. They don't know what's in this budget, I don't know what's in this budget. And somebody awhile ago said, 'Well, the four (4) caucuses participated.' Oh really? Where was I? I didn't participate. And let me make it very clear, I'm not criticizing the four (4) Leaders. They work hard, they go to meeting after meeting after meeting. And the budgeteers work hard, but what am I down here, a doorstop? We don't participate. We don't know what's in this budget. Many of you and I and others introduced legislation this year that said when the budget is drafted, set it on our desk for 24 hours, or 48 hours. Let us look through it, let us read it, give the press a copy. Let the public get on the ... on the website and let them read it line by line by line, so that we know what's in it. This is not the best we can do, this thing, almost one thousand, four hundred (1,400)

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

pages, put on our desks and we're told in a matter of 1 hour, take it or leave it. Well, I've had it, and I'm just about ready to leave it and I think maybe we should all leave it until we're all a part of the process. Go back to the way it was when I came down here. The appropriations committees did the bulk of the work and we might spend a week letting them present the budget, day after day, and we knew what was in it. Now, this budget is executive driven, and driven by a very small number of people. I respect them, I respect the work they do, but I'm not going to go home and tell people this is a great budget because I don't know what the hell's in it."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman... Representative Turner in the Chair. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Miller, for what reason do you rise?"

Miller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

Miller: "I'm going to miss that Bill Black. A question in regarding higher ed and legislation intent. I noticed in our analysis, Representative Hannig, that it's additional seven million dollars (\$7,000,000) was added for the Illinois Community College Board. Can you elaborate on that?"

Hannig: "So, could you repeat the question, I'm not certain I understood it?"

Miller: "Under the Illinois Community College Board section, there's an additional seven million dollars (\$7,000,000) GRF increase to the base operating grants."

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

Hannig: "So, that was... so as the negotiations progressed, as I said in my introduction, all four (4) caucuses we're involved, and what I think we are all aware of is that this document changes from moment to moment. And this was one of the later changes, along with the AFSCME change, to hire some additional people. So, this is an item, probably, that was not in your committee yesterday but was added after the committee held its hearing. There was some discussion and I think that there was some pressures that came from the Higher Ed Committee to put this in. And so it was added at that time, Representative."

Miller: "I think just personally, I think it's great that it's in there. We are far away from where the Illinois Community College System should be, but at least I think that's in the right direction. Also, with this 7.2 million (7,200,000) to cover the Illinois veterans' grant. We want to make sure, at least for legislative intent, that... that seven million dollars (\$7,000,000) isn't a way for the Illinois student... ISAC to switch funds or delete their budget by seven million dollars (\$7,000,000). Is that what you're intention with this addition is?"

Hannig: "This would... our intention would be that this would be in addition to the money that they would get from all other grants and formulas, that this would help reimburse what we would think is about 50 percent of the cost that the community colleges absorb by providing these classes to veterans."

Miller: "Okay, so... so overall, in addition to the college readiness grant, the Illinois Community College Board would

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

seek an additional... would get an additional almost fourteen almost fifteen million dollars (\$15,000,000)?

Hannig: "Fourteen point three (14,300,000), that's correct."

"All right, thank you. Just to the Bill. I just want Miller: to comment on the higher education piece, some of the salient points. Members on both sides of the aisle wanted to see more money go towards MAP, that helps every student in the State of Illinois. Almost twenty-seven million (27,000,000) of GRF increase into the MAP funding, I think that's a good thing. The elimination of MAP PLUS program is a thing that our committee wanted in addition to overall 2 percent increasing to all the universities in the State of Illinois, totaling about twenty-six million dollars (\$26,000,000), a little bit over. It's needed for our state, it's to make sure that our universities are some of the most affordable and accessible universities. I think we have some of the finest universities in the State of Illinois. In addition, it helps us try to prepare those students who are trying to get the touchdown, to be educated, which we all know is important, to help them have a leg up to try to seek a college education. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Bond, Representative Stephens, for what reason do you rise?"

Stephens: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to...
first of all, address the remarks of the Gentleman from
Madison earlier, who I suppose on behalf of the Governor
was, if I understood correctly, first of all upset at no
capital program. Well, I recall the process of this last
year, back in February, House Republicans introduced the

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

most commonsense capital that we've seen in years. We put ourselves out front on the issue. And we agreed with the Representative from Madison, yes, we want to put people to work, we want to invest in the infrastructure. He and I both agree that we need to build a new bridge across the Mississippi River. We, on this side of the aisle, have led the way and we still say to this day, let's have a capital program, commonsense capital program that is paid for with a commonsense fund that is determined and guaranteed for the course of the bonds. That's what we still embrace. And the Gentleman seemed to be disappointed. phrases, it's not enough. Over two billion (\$2,000,000,000) increase in spending and it's not enough. It's not enough? Are you kidding me? Almost six hundred million dollars (\$600,000,000) in increased funding for education, elementary and secondary education in the State That's not enough? A four hundred... or four of Illinois. million (4,000,000)... four hundred dollar (\$400) increase in the student... the base fund for student education. Four hundred dollar (\$400) increase, that's not enough? What is enough? A trillion (1,000,000,000,000), two trillion (2,000,000,000,000)? A historic increase in education funding. I believe the Gentleman might be disappointed because there's something that's not here, that we're not talking about today that we're very proud of. something that's not here, it's called the Gross Receipts And that's what this is all about. The Gross Receipts Tax was the Governor's key idea of the year. Governor Rod Blagojevich said let's pass the most onerous,

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

biggest tax increase in the State of Illinois. And this House, with the Gentleman from Madison's support, voted 107 to 0, 107 to 0, to reject the Gross Receipts Tax, and yet, there is still disappointment from the Gentleman from Madison and from the second floor. Still disappointment, still some hope in their heart and in their mind, that we can pass some three (3) or four (4) or five (5) billion dollar (\$5,000,000,000) tax increase. That's what the disappointment is about. Is this the best budget the House... this General Assembly's ever passed? No, I don't think so. Could I tweak it some more? Yes, I could. we stand here in the late days of August, in a historical long and painful Session, and finally, we're getting somewhere. The best indication that it might be the right direction is everybody's not happy. That's okay with me. We're meeting some long-term obligations; we're making a conscious effort to fund pensions. We're doing the right thing in terms of education and we're doing it without raising taxes. That is a commonsense direction. Could we do better, can we stay another day, stay another week? Yes, we'll stay with you, Representative. Yes, Governor, we'll stay as long as you say. But finally, I think in response to the people of Illinois, we are setting a proper course and I stand in support of this budget."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Leitch, for what reason do you rise?"

Leitch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?" Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

- Leitch: "Gary, I'd like to clarify again the situation as it relates to the hospitals and the supplemental. Can you hear me okay?"
- Hannig: "Yes, I can hear you, Representative."
- Leitch: "That's amazing in and of itself. If the Governor doesn't... does sign the supplemental then the hospitals will have the appropriation authority to be paid, is that correct?"
- Hannig: "That's correct."
- Leitch: "What happens if the Governor does not sign the supplemental as it pertains to this budget?"
- Hannnig: "Well, actually, in the technical sense if he doesn't sign the supplemental, it becomes law..."
- Leitch: "I'm sorry. Mr. Speaker, I can't hear him."
- Hannig: "If he doesn't sign it that is if he takes no action, it becomes law, I believe, on midnight at Monday. But if he vetos that section of the law, then it creates a problem for our hospitals."
- Leitch: "So, what you're saying is, were that Bill to be vetoed or were it to be vetoed in this budget before us now, there is not sufficient appropriation authority to pay the hospital money."
- Hannnig: "So, what we have... so, what we have in this budget is the spending that would go out in the '08 budget, that is in the '08 fiscal year. So we would assume, and I think we have to just assume, that the Governor will sign, at least that portion of the supplemental. But you are correct, if he does not, if he vetos the whole Bill or that part of the

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

Bill, then we have to find another mechanism to fund that part of the hospital assessment."

Leitch: "Okay. Well, thank you. I just think, Mr. Speaker, that it's very important that Members understand the implications of this measure as proposed as it relates to the supplemental. It's critically important that at least the hospital part of the supplemental be signed. Our hospitals have been waiting way too long for the money that's been promised them and I would urge that the Governor does sign at least that part of the supplemental and I thank you for your answer."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Osterman, for what reason do you rise?"

Osterman: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

Osterman: "Representative Hannig, a few questions about child care and the budget goes up an additional three million dollars (\$3,000,000) in this coming year."

Hannig: "Yes, that's correct."

Osterman: "Additionally, over the last year there have been a number of cost-saving measures that have been implemented by the department, which has enabled the savings, and this budget reflects the increased rates for the SEIU contract for home child care workers. Child care centers get a rate increase that was part of a negotiation in conjunction with the SEIU."

Hannig: "Yes, that's correct, Representative."

Osterman: "Additionally, there's another seven million dollars (\$7,000,000) for health care for the home child care

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

workers that goes to the SEIU, and it's my hope and the members of the Human Services Committee, that... make sure that that money goes to provide health care for those home child care workers. That's something that we will be monitoring in the years to come. Additionally, in the area of child care, though, is... the department has not had waiting lists and it is our hope with this budget, and the department has not said otherwise, that they will be able to manage these increases under the budget that we're voting on and passing today."

Hannig: "That's correct."

Osterman: "Okay. Additionally, there's twenty-five million dollars (\$25,000,000) for early childhood development?"

Hannig: "Yes, Representative."

Osterman: "Okay. Which I think is a very important part of this budget. In my community in the last two (2) years I've had three (3) additional schools that have added Pre-K classes, ninety (90) children have had the chance to go to Pre-K that otherwise would not have been able to. I think by adding this by money into the child care budget, although it was not the thirty million (\$30,000,000) that was in the Governor's introduced budget, this is going to enable children around the state to get the early start they need to be successful in life. There have been a number of comments about infrastructure and capital, and to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle I will say that those on this side of the aisle want capital as much as you do. Our state is woefully behind; there are needs that have been built up. But in addition

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

to capital, many of us who worked very hard on the area of public transportation know that those in Cook County and in northern Illinois as well as other parts of the state desperately need money for public transportation. And although it's not in this budget today, it is my hope that we work together as we have worked together to fashion the budget we're voting on, to address the issues of capital, but also address the issues of public transportation for Chicago and the suburbs as well other parts of the State of Illinois. So I hope that we use this model of working together today, in the future to deal with our capital needs as well as public transportation and, quite frankly, as we deal with out budget next year. We should always try to work in a bipartisan fashion. I think that's something that the people back home expect us to do."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Fritchey, for what reason do you rise?"

Fritchey: "Thank you, Speaker. To the Bill. I respect all the comments that have been made so far, they've all been very valid and I think they've all tried to get at what is in and what isn't in this budget. This is... despite the fact that it took us until August to get here, this is a responsible piece of work. This is what happens when Leaders act like Leaders and they work together. One of the previous speakers had tried to shake the Democrats, and even though it was one of the Democrats that did that, by saying that the AFL doesn't support this legislation, by saying that it doesn't do enough for education. What the

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

speaker omitted to say is that what they did support was legislation that would increase the income tax in order to systemically change education funding and how we fund education. That was House Bill 750. I supported that, a number of people on both sides of the aisle supported that legislation. What's problematic, people, is it is tough to tell if this is the beginning of the end or the end of the beginning. On behalf of the Governor, the Gentleman from Madison said this budget will never, ever become law, that it would never become signed. If this Bill does not get signed next week, we are going to face very real deadlines. Comptroller Hynes is entirely right, people will go out... will go without their paycheck. If this budget doesn't get signed, state operations will start to shutdown. Governor spent several months here saying that it was GRT or nothing. He was finally willing to walk away from that, I believe, but he's still saying now that this budget doesn't do enough. You cannot rule out every option and then decry that there are no options left on the table. Ladies and Gentlemen in this chamber, across the rotunda, and I hope on the second floor, people need to understand a budget will only be accomplished by compromise. As Representative Stephens said, we may have achieved the right compromise at a time when nobody is fully happy. That's what government is about is finding a compromise where people get what they need. This is a responsible budge from the standpoint of it doesn't meet everybody's wish list, it does meet everybody's needs list. Just like a household, you have to prioritize what it is you want and

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

what it is you can afford. We would all like to do more for our constituents; we would all like to see other thing accomplished. We need to live within our means. naysayers that will say that it is a frailty in Democratic Party that a Democratic Legislature Democratic Governor cannot come to agreement until October ... I would submit that perhaps it is a bright until August. sign for the Democratic Party that we are not simply willing to tax and spend our way out of a situation of financial difficulty. We are exercising responsibility, but at the same time we are increasing funding in education to unforeseen levels. We are meeting our pension obligations. We are meeting the operational needs of the state, and we are preparing ourselves to go forward. It is a responsible budget. I salute Tom Cross, the Speaker, Emil, Frank Watson for working together to try to craft a document that everybody can live with, that we can all take back to our districts and we'll move forward. Are there things that still need to be met? Yes, there Social service workers are still not being paid enough. Education funding reform still needs to addressed. Property tax funding reform still needs to be addressed. We still need to meet a capital budget to take care of the infrastructure of this state. We're going to have to make tough decisions in order to get there, but tough decisions have been made in order to get here. one decision that is not tenable is the decision that nothing on the table is acceptable and that my way or the highway is going to be the way to govern this state.

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

not going to be the way to govern this state, the way to govern this state is going to be through increased cooperation, across the aisle, through every region of this state. I think that's what this budget does and I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

- Speaker Turner: "The Lady from DuPage, Representative Bellock, for what reason do you rise?"
- Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."
- Bellock: "I wanted to ask a question about the Public Health budget, about the access to care, the one million dollars (\$1,000,000). Is that access to care just for the Cook County program or is that money to be divided up between access DuPage and the Kendall County-Dekalb that's starting up, programs?"
- Hannig: "It's my understanding, Representative, that the… that it's set up by definition that the access to care is a Cook County component. It's Cook County."
- Bellock: "So, it's specifically just for Cook County not for the other access programs in the rest of the state that help the uninsured?"
- Hannig: "That's the way I understand it, Representative."
- Bellock: "Okay. We're extremely disappointed in that because we feel that those are the number one model projects throughout this state that are helping the uninsured, which is the number one issue we're trying to address here in health care."

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

- Hannig: "Representative, this was, as I said in my opening, this was a negotiated budget and all four (4) caucuses participated, and some caucuses wanted to put some money in these parts of the state and others wanted to put them in those parts of the sate, and some wanted to do this program and some wanted to do that. So, this was an item that was worked out, but it is, ya know, a million dollars (\$1,000,000) for Cook County."
- Bellock: "Okay. I also wanted to ask, in that Department of Public Health budget, what... the money was definitely reinstated for the grants for the local health departments at five million dollars (\$5,000,000)?"
- Hannig: "Yes, so they will have an additional five million dollars (\$5,000,000), that's correct."
- Bellock: "And that's to be split up amongst... evenly amongst all health departments in the state."
- Hannig: "I'm advised evenly. Everyone gets an exact share, the same share."
- Bellock: "Okay. There are a lot of us that are disappointed that there isn't more money going into those local public health departments because we put so many demands on them to mandate and five million (5,000,000) doesn't seem like a lot to cover all the health departments in the state. But as far as a lot of the other things that are in this budget, I would support, and I want to thank Representative Mulligan and Representative Feigenholtz for all the time they put in on the Human Service, for all the COLA increases for DASA, the COLA increases for DD, money for autism, which we've all strived for, money for rural health

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

care and especially, money to go towards the children's wavier... so that we can provide more services for autistic children, disabled children, and mentally ill children in Illinois. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Dunkin, for what reason do you rise?"

Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

Dunkin: "There he is. Representative, I just finished reading most of this here and I didn't see CTA in this budget. I didn't see any capital programs in this budget. I didn't see any special Member initiatives in this budget as well. I'm trying to understand if we're going to vote for a budget that the Governor is not going to sign, why are we voting for a budget if there's no agreement?"

Hannig: "If that's a question, Representative, I'll try to answer it. We have an obligation to make a budget. The Governor proposes the budget, but we have an obligation to pass a budget. Now, we're supposed to do that by the end of May. The fiscal year ends at the end of June. We did one temporary budget and here we are in August. four (4) Leaders from each of the caucuses have met. They've tried to work together. There have been differences, they've worked through those differences as they are capable of doing. And now we have an agreement, that I believe represents what all four (4) caucuses would say is the best that we could do with the money that we have available. And I think it's time that we pass it. Now, having said that, are there other issues out there? I

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

would concede that there are issues out there that we have to deal with. But we don't have to deal with those issues today, but I think if we don't deal with this issue we're going to start to see school districts that don't get paid, state employees that don't get paid, and vendors who don't get paid. So that's why I think there's an importance to try to advance this Bill at this time."

Dunkin: "Representative, I don't think there is any Member here in this Body that wants to see a government shutdown, that wants to not see someone get paid here in the State of Illinois for doing there fair share of work. I support that wholeheartedly. But I'm also a realist. And so again, I'm trying to understand if we pass this budget, and I voted for a budget back on May 30 as well, as you did. But if the Governor is not going to sign the budget, does that mean people get paid or they don't get paid?"

Hannig: "Well Representative, I guess that depends on what the Governor does. When you say he doesn't sign it, does that mean that he vetoes it? I mean... I don't know that he's going to sign it or he's not going to sign it. I don't know that he's going to veto it or he's not going to veto it. Ya know, the Governor has that decision, that's his authority and his power. We have the authority to pass the budget and I think we need... we have an obligation to pass the budget and I think we need to live up to our obligation and do our part of the equation, which is to pass the budget. Then the Governor can decide what it is he wishes to do with it."

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

Dunkin: "So we passed a budget May 30, this chamber, we sent it over to the Senate, nothing happened. We met our obligation, the Governor still didn't sign the budget. Well, we voted on the budget here in late May, this Governor is not in agreement... in agreeance with this here. Where are we going, what's the end game? Is this another opportunity for us to put a vote on something and nothing's going to happen and we're going to be back to square one where individuals are not going to get paid? Where the state shutdown is imminent? Is that what's going to happen?"

Hannig: "Well, Representative, I can tell you that if we do nothing those things will happen. If we pass this budget at least there's an opportunity that those... there's a chance that those things won't happen. So I think that's really the alternatives we have in front of us today. Do nothing and we're certain we're going to have a meltdown in State Government or do what we are obligated and elected to do, which is to pass a budget, and then ask the Governor to do what he is elected to do."

Dunkin: "But didn't we do that at the end of May... May 30, in this chamber? We met our obligation and again we're still at a standstill and today we have a budget where there's no agreement with five (5) people. You mentioned four (4), but he has to sign this thing or do something. If not, we're going to be back here next week, tomorrow, next month, asking the same question, going through the similar exercise. Is that true, Representative?"

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

- Hannig: "Representative, it could be true if we pass this budget and the Governor sits on it. But it will be true if we do nothing."
- Dunkin: "Well, let me ask a more simple question. Why is it public transportation, Chicago CTA in particular, not in this packet here? Since we are also obligated to make sure that we impede crisis in our state. That is a crisis that none of us from the Metropolitan area, one of the most wealthiest area and the busiest transit systems in the Midwest portion of this country, that happens to be in our state. What happens if then... if they shutdown because there is no money in here for CTA?"
- Hannig: "We'll first of all, Representative, this is an appropriation Bill. And in order to deal with most of the issues with the CTA and the RTA, we first have to pass a substantive Bill, which... which would address those issues. There could be, perhaps, as a part of that agreement, some need to do an appropriation Bill and at that time we do have vehicles in the House and in the Senate that we could pair with the appropriate substantive Bill and send them both on to the Governor for his signature. So..."
- Dunkin: "Representative, look, there are a lot of pages in here. We couldn't find one or two pages to put the CTA in here? This issue is pretty significant for us that live up in that part of the state. Just as the Ameren issue or the rate utility issue was significant for downstaters here in Springfield, southern Illinois. Somehow we found the will and the way to settle that scenario. We couldn't find one

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

opportunity, one page in this budget to deal with the CTA crisis? Not one?"

Hannig: "Representative, if that's a question, I think that there will be an opportunity to deal with this crisis before, what I believe is, the date that they're threatening or that we're told that there would be a cut back in services and increases in fees and that's September 1. So we're not to that date yet."

Dunkin: "Well, September 1 for a number of us, is around the And for millions of citizens here in this state business that depend on public transportation, families, senior citizens, youth, trying to go to school, people going... trying to get to their doctor's appointment who don't have a car need to have assurance that September 1 they're going to be able to go to school, go to work, go to their business. So if we can figure out the situation as relates to public utilities and all the number of other issues, that should be a priority as well here in this budget. And lastly, with no capital program... every year, at least since I've been here, there has not been a capital program that we've voted on. We know that infrastructure is failing in the City of Chicago, in central Illinois, western Illinois and southern Illinois. agreed on this right here, as Democrats and Republicans, we should also be able to agree on a capital If we can agree on this budget we should also be able to agree on a safety net health care plan that many Members here in this chamber helped craft, aside from... in addition to the Governor's budget, or his health care plan.

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

So, I'm still scratching my head as befuddled as ever as of why CTA is not in this plan, why there is no capital Bill here, why there's no health care in this Bill? And somehow we just missed the opportunity to have the Governor on board because if he's not going to sign this, people are not going to get paid, state government's going to shutdown and we are going to be back here as early as tomorrow, next week, and then some. So I'm still scratching my head as I look through this huge budget that doesn't have some of these basic concerns that impact citizens here in the State of Illinois. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "And while we're talking about budgets, I'd like to recognize the Treasurer of this State, Alexi Giannoulias in the back of the room, standing back... We'll be sending you the money soon. Representative Boland, the Gentleman from Rock Island, for what reason do you rise?"

Boland: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I'm going to support this Bill and I believe there's a lot of good things in it, increased staffing for our correctional institutions and our juvenile facilities and there's no tax increase. There's a lot of really good things there, but I'd like to point out a couple things I feel are lacking and that hopefully, in the future we're going to take a bigger look at. One is the ... in the Governor ... Lieutenant Governor's budget, I know they had wanted to spend several million dollars more for broadband access, particularly for important rural areas. And this is so Representative Connie Howard knows and is the leader in, the whole problem of the technological divide. This is

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

crucial, it's crucial for our urban areas, particularly where there are citizens of lower income and particularly it's very important for our rural areas. So that those areas... those people in there can have access to broadband so that they can really economically develop the wave of And economic development depends technology and technological access. So I hope that down in our next budget we'll give greater consideration to that request from the Lieutenant Governor's Office for broadband access. The other problem that I see in this budget and in the one that we passed last year, as well, and the one the year before, is the funding for higher education, for our state universities. We're doing a little bit better job as Representative Black had pointed out for our community colleges. In the past we neglected them, now we're playing catch up with them, which is good. But we really are, what I consider, neglecting our state universities. They are the engine of future economic development. They're the future of possibilities of social advancement. And we've only advocated 2 percent increase for them in this budget, 2 percent last year, 0 percent before that. Folks, we just can't do this. We're going to start losing some of our top people. We are going to start losing our brain power to other areas. going to have brain drain that will be going to other states. I happen to know some individuals who are looking already in this direction. So, I would hope that when we put together next year's budget that we give a greater percentage increase to our state universities. They are

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

our hope for the future. If you look at those states that are making the most economic progress, it is those states that at garnering support for our... for their higher education institutions. And lastly, let me address the CTA I'm a downstater. I've never ridden on the CTA busses, probably never will. But from what I have read, they have multiple bus breakdowns, inconveniencing people, particularly those of lower income, and we need to address I think we will in future legislation but I want to make sure that the CTA also gets a message and that is that when they replace these busses, that they look at replacing them with alternative fuel busses, hybrid busses, busses that use biodiesel, busses that use natural gas, so that we can have a great step forward in lessening our dependence upon foreign oil, upon increasing our national security, and striking a blow against those higher fuel tax... or prices that our autos and trucks are facing right today. So, those are just some issues that I hope the Membership will keep in mind as we look down the future and that our Leadership will look at as we look at a following budget. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "There's approximately twelve (12) speakers yet to speak on this issue. I just want to let the Membership know in case it's been said and you don't want to say it, let us know. The next speaker will be the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Riley."

Riley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor please yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

Riley: "I don't know about in your districts, but I'm sure that you are getting similar refrains, people are telling us it's time to come home. It's time to wrap up negotiations and come home and share with them the stewardship that we've been engaged in down here. One thing everybody has to remember is with the budget impasse and other problems that we've had, there've been thousands of Bills that we've advanced and we've advanced them together on a bipartisan nature. And the same thing can be said for the development of this current budget. I've never been in the position in other units of government that I've served in where everyone loves the budget and maybe that's a good thing. But we're already in extra Session. I here it from my constituents all the time, I'm sure you hear it from yours. guess to paraphrase Shakespeare, we're in undiscovered country when it comes to this extra Session. Let's come home. Let's come home and show our stewardship. One question I have about the budget, I looked at the... the aeronautics section and I didn't see any subsequent increases in that part of the budget. Representative Boland said something about an economic engine. economic engine, at least some of us in the southern suburbs of Chicago think, is a third airport. And I don't see a lot of movement where that's concerned. That and many other initiatives for us would be great economic engines to help a fantastic area of the Chicagoland region that's growing. Could you explain to me what's happening with regard to the third airport, was there money included?

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

- And what's happening with that? And land acquisition money, also."
- Hannig: "Representative, on the issue of the third airport, I think that whatever dollars have been appropriated, and I think in the past we've done some moneys to purchase some land and those kinds of items. I think most of what you would probably need to do to build a third airport would be items that would be capital. So it would be, I think, largely contingent upon a capital budget."
- Riley: "Capital, but it would also be concomitant moneys that would come through the budgetary process too, wouldn't you say?"
- Hannig: "Right. So typically, you have a operations budget that pays for the day-to-day operations of the State of Illinois. And then we will from time-to-time, it used to be every year, but now it's from time-to-time, we pass a capital budget where we deal with those kinds of bricks and mortar items that usually have a long life. And we typically, as we do in our personal life when we buy a home, we borrow the money. And we pay it off over the life of that asset. So much of what you would do with... if you build a new airport for example, and particularly, since it would be an expensive proposition will come, I would think from a capital Bill."
- Riley: "But again, not to belabor the point, something like land acquisition would come from operating it, that wouldn't come from capital."
- Hannig: "It probably could go either way, I mean capital... in the sense that just like when you buy your house, I mean

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

you don't pay for the… you don't pay cash for the ground and then… and the borrow against the building. So, if you're using it for a long-term purpose then it makes sense to use a long-term borrowing instrument, a bond."

Riley: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. I wanted to make that point, that point is salient. The point will still always be out there, because to a lot of us it is extremely important. We want to see all of the areas of the Metropolitan area of Chicago grow and certainly the south suburbs. To the Bill itself, I think I've made my point earlier, certainly with regard to education and a lot of other issues. It's not everything certainly that I would want, but as I say, I think our constituents are speaking to us, they're certainly speaking to me. They're telling us to wrap it up and to come home and to share with them our stewardship and I think that supporting this Bill is one way of doing it. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Kendall, Leader Cross."

Cross: "Thanks, Mr. Speaker. I'm not going to speak a whole... speak a long time, just want to make a couple comments and observations about today's budget, and some of this has been made and some of it has not. The question was raised a little while ago or at least the question was to the Sponsor of the Bill, why are we going to vote on this if it's not going to get signed? Well, I don't know that any body knows what's going to happen to this Bill. But we cannot sit here any longer and do nothing with respect to a budget. We are here on August 9, we have no budget. We are close to, I think the term is government shutdown,

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

people are about to not get paid, services from this state are not far away from stopping. Whether it's school districts, whether it's social service agencies, whether it's casinos. Whatever the case is our lack of ability to get a compromise or a budget creates hardship and pain for a number of people throughout the State of Illinois. have a responsibility to get or work done. We have got to start somewhere. And unfortunately, we don't have agreement with the five (5) parties if you will, but until we get that agreement, we've got to get the ball rolling and that ball starts here. It's starting in the House, it doesn't seem... going to be started in the Senate, so we've got to take it upon ourselves in the House to move forward on getting a budget done. And it's a good budget and a number of people have worked on this budget and they're to be commended on it. It's a good budget with respect to education, with respect to Human Services, it's a good budget in that it makes the pension payment, it takes care of contractual obligations, it takes care of Medicaid. Pressures that are there that we have to acknowledge and we have to respond to and we're taking care of those. It does it without raising taxes, is something that was important to us as a Republican Caucus. It doesn't raise general... it doesn't raise income tax, sales tax, GRT, generation tax, payroll tax. All of those taxes that we think are harmful to the economy of the State of Illinois. Those are all good things, for that I applaud the people that put this budget together. There has been a lot of discussion, especially on the other side of the aisle, and I... there are

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

concerns on ours as well about the transportation problem in the City of Chicago, specifically with respect to the No one wants there to be hardship with respect to transportation in the City of Chicago. Those of us in the suburbs are concerned about it. I suspect Members of our side that represent downstate aren't looking for problems for the CTA, no one wants to harm a transportation region by neglecting it. But I think we need to recognize that we need to take care of transportation on a regional basis and while the CTA is extremely important, a capital Bill to address regional problems, and I don't want anyone outside the City of Chicago or the suburban area to suggest that I... to believe that I'm ignoring the transportation needs throughout the rest of the State of Illinois, they're huge needs with respect to transportation outside the City of Chicago and the suburban area. But in the context of this discussion about the CTA, we can not neglect the regional concept or the regional needs of transportation in the Chicagoland area. I live thirty-five (35) to forty (40) miles from the City of Chicago in Osweego, Illinois. (10) years, a go it took me and hour to get to the City of Chicago, today it takes me anywhere from and hour and a half to 2 hours to get to the City of Chicago. because there are so many more people out in the suburban areas going into the City of Chicago, going into work, going in to play, going in for medical care. Whatever the case is, we're going into the City on a regular basis and we are not doing it efficiently. CTA needs to work, the RTA needs to work Metra needs to work, PACE needs to work,

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

but our roads in the suburban areas have got to work, also. People that live in the suburbs and the Chicago Metropolitan Area cannot function effectively efficiently when it takes them 2 hours to go thirty-five (35) or forty (40) miles. You can't get to you job in a timely manner, you can't get your kids to school in a timely manner. People don't like sitting in traffic 2 hours one way and 2 hours the other way. We have got to address the transportation needs in the whole state and that means widening roads, lengthening roads, improving roads, and we have got to do a capital Bill. We have got address the infrastructure needs in the State Illinois. And I suggest that we need to simultaneously with the needs and concerns of the CTA, the RTA, Metra and PACE. We cannot ignore one or the other. Please understand I'm not suggesting we ignore the CTA needs, RTA, et cetera, we have got to take care of them This capital Bill that's being discussed does more than just take care of roads. It addresses needs that we've neglected as a state for the last eight (8) years. We've ignored the needs of state facilities, needs of improvements, needs of expansion, needs of additions. We've ignored the needs of the universities, we've ignored the needs of community colleges, we've ignored the needs with respect to technology, the area of technology. ignored the needs of improvements, sewer improvements. The list goes on and on and on. And as a state, we have a responsibility to maintain and improve things from an infrastructure basis, meaning we have got to

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

take it upon ourselves to do a capital Bill. One of the other benefits of capital that we forget... an economy's starting to soften. We haven't seen the impact of that as much as perhaps other parts of the country because we've had some significant road work in the Chicagoland area because of the tollway expansion and extension, but that's going to soon stop. We need to look and recognize the huge benefits that are associated with a ten billion plus (10,000,000,000+) infrastructure Bill, countless around the whole state. From Quincy, where there are huge needs, to Carbondale to Danville to Champaign and northeastern Illinois. So, Mr. Speaker, it's a good budget. It's a budget like any budget, I think someone said, it's not perfect, but it's a starting point. I hope it gets legs when it leaves out of this chamber, I think this Bill is going to pass with a good number of votes, large number of votes. And then the Senate will have an opportunity to vote up or down on this. I assume the Governor will take a hard look at it. It keeps us from shutting down, it makes sure families that rely on state services get paid, those people that need the paycheck, who live paycheck to paycheck as many people do, need us to fulfill our responsibility. But again, I caution we can't leave this chamber in the next few weeks or the next few days without acknowledging or without addressing in a real way the capital needs as well as the CTA problems in the State of Illinois. So with that, Mr. Speaker, I'd appreciate any 'aye' vote. Thank you."

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang, for what reason do you rise?"

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I rise in support of this Bill. And you know, the words of Leader Cross are correct, we have to do something now. We've been here a very long time. This is probably a Bill that if we had the cooperation of the second floor earlier this year, could have been passed much earlier this year, but we did not have it. And so the four (4) Legislative Leaders ought to be applauded for getting together and taking care of the business of the Legislature without reference to Governor's involvement. I think it was a brilliant move. I think it was the right thing to do, and we don't know what the Governor will do when we pass this, but we know that we've done good work here. Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill is not perfect, no budget ever is. If you gave every one of us on this floor fifty-five billion dollars (\$55,000,000,000) to spend, we would all find good ways to spend it, but each and every one of the 118 of us would find a different way to spend that fifty-five billion dollars (\$55,000,000,000). And so it goes with all of the people we try to help, the people in education, the people in labor, the people who rely on state services, the people... the vendors of the State of Illinois et cetera. There is no perfect budget and there is no amount of money that will satisfy the needs of Illinois. And there is no amount of money... if you just take one part of this, no amount of money that will satisfy all the needs of education in the State of Illinois. So it's no wonder that

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

this budget has six hundred million (\$6,000,000,000) in it for elementary and secondary schools in new money, it's no wonder that some who are education advocates would be opposed. And it's no wonder that those who would want more money for the developmentally disabled are opposed. And it's no wonder that those who want more money for mental health are opposed. We are for all of these things, but we have a responsibility to only spend what we have. This budget does that and it does that in a fair way, an impartial way and addresses needs in all regions of the state in both Democratic and Republican Every Legislator has constituents who will benefit from this legislation and yes, every legislator has constituents who will be disappointed. But I believe, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, that this fairly and accurately reflects what we can do. Remember where we came from. We came from a situation where we have Governor who wanted to spend three billion dollars (\$3,000,000,000) more than we have. Three billion dollars (\$3,000,000,000) more than this budget would provide for. Three billion dollars (\$3,000,000,000) more than the people of Illinois have provided us to expend on their behalf. And so for those who would like more I say, well, many of us would like more, also. And for those who would say we'd like the priorities moved around, many of us would say, well, we would spend a few more dollars here and a few less dollars here, but that's what the negotiation process is in putting a budget together. This is a good budget. Perfect, no, but it reflects what we could do today to move along the

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

business of the State of Illinois. It misses out on capital, hopefully, we'll be coming back to deal with that because all four (4)Caucuses agree that we infrastructure needs in the State of Illinois that need to be addressed and all four (4) Caucuses agree that we ought to come back and do that, that's good news. And I know we'll find a way to make that happen as we will mass transit. So these are important things we must do and I believe we will do. Let me say a special word to education advocates, we are all education advocates, but you'll recall that early this year there was a lot of talk about new momentum to grab great changes in how we fund schools and we created an Education Caucus and we had a lot of talk form a lot of advocates out in the world about how we're going to make it happen this year. But recall how some of us, including myself, said we've never done it before, what makes you think we're going to do it now? And that's why I at one point had proposed a Constitutional Amendment that dramatically would have changed how we fund schools. That did not move forward but the theory was, Ladies and Gentlemen, that if we didn't get ourselves forced by the constituents we all represent to act in terms of a completely new way to fund schools that we would never, ever do it. And again, the proof is in the pudding. we're putting a substantial amount of new dollars into education, we have not and we may never, unless we're forced to by the people of the State of Illinois, have a completely new mechanism to make sure schools are funded better and so we... in a way that deals with the inequities

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

from region to region, from county to county, from village to village. And so we need to come back and address that. We need to find a way to have a completely different plan for funding schools and many of you agree with that, but we haven't made it happen yet. And so let's pledge over the next months, maybe in Veto Session, maybe next spring to actually bring to fruition not just more money for schools, not just a plan like 750, which many did not favor, but a completely new way to do this, so that the education advocates who think there's not enough money for schools in this budget will work with us to have a new plan and a new way and a new vision for funding schools. We certainly haven't done that here, but I believe we've done a good job for schools. We can do better working together. And, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, this budget needs to be passed today. The people of Illinois need and demand the services that a state budget provides to them; we can wait no longer for this. Please vote 'aye'."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Malaro, for what reason do you rise?"

Malaro: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill."

Speaker Turner: "To the Bill."

Malaro: "Let's talk politics for a second and not talk budgetary so we know where we're going. I think if every Legislator in this room, including the Governor and every Legislator across the hall, if you wound up saying what's your hundred (100) priorities, what do you want to see done, what do you want to make a budget? We could probably agree a hundred (100) out of a hundred (100). The problem

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

is there is not enough money to do all hundred (100), so you come up and say let's narrow it to ten (10) or fifteen (15). Now that's where the problem comes up. Priorities are the problems. Now the Governor has a priority with health care, universal affordable health care. Nobody's against that, we're going to have to figure out how to pay for it, but I think it's a great idea. We're talking about more money for education, I think this budget calls for President Jones wanted a billion and a half, other people want more or less, whatever it may be, priorities. Speaker has his priorities, makes sense... he also makes sense to me. Let's pass a budget that makes sense and when it comes to gaming, capital, transportation, let's do that at the end of next week, let's do it that way. Let me tell you what's exactly I feel is going to happen. The Senate this afternoon is going to go to appropriation committee. They're going to call a different House Bill. Thev're going to put an Amendment on it and it's basically going to be the same Bill here. Maybe there's a little fight after who's going to control it, but I feel that the Senate is going to pass the exact same Bill that we're calling right They may pass this Bill, whatever number this is, 3860, or they may pass another Bill, but by late tonight your going to see a bill that's going to be passed that's the same exact Bill by both Houses. Now someone said, what is the governor going to do? Okay. That's a good question. What is the Governor going to do? All right, well he only has three (3) choices. I mean either he vetoes it, he signs it, or he does nothing. Now here's

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

where the Governor and we have a little bit of a problem. I like the fight that we've been having for the last six (6) months, it was a fight worth having. Universal health affordable, that makes since to me; not bloating the budget five billion dollars (\$5,000,000,000), that make sense to Capital Bill, transportation Bill, that all makes sense to me. Income tax, gross receipts tax, other forms, sweeps, that all makes sense to me. So we had to fight but is where overriding sense makes that we somewhere in this ivory tower called Springfield. There thirty-five/forty thousand (35,000-45,000) workers; there are a hundred thousand (100,000) people who are involved in vendors who work for the state. hundred and fifty thousand (150,000) people, who live check to check, who worry about their checks. And we cannot forget that. Now, I'm not saying this is a perfect budget, far from it, but I want to tell those hundred and fifty thousand (150,000) people, and I want to tell everybody else in the State of Illinois that this is what's going to happen today. We are going to pass a budget, we are going to come back whether it's by invitation of Speaker Madigan, President Jones, or the Governor, we are going to come back and we are going to pass a gaming capital Bill and we're going to pass a transportation Bill that takes care of the whole northeast corridor of the State of Illinois as well as downstate. We are not leaving this capital 'til we do our job. This is just the first step in that job. We are going to come back and we are going to deal with capital, not maybe, we are going to do it. We are going to come out

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

and do what needs to be done for the RTA and the CTA', not maybe, we are going to do it. And yes, whether we like it or not, we're going to talk about health care. I don't know if we're going to get it done and what form it's going to take, but we're going to do all of that. So I think the reason we have to vote for this is to let those hundred and fifty thousand (150,000) people know they forgotten, they're going to get their checks. The Senate will pass this Bill. Now, my prediction is, and I hope, that the Governor signs this Bill. Now, I know that may sound crazy, to a lot of people in this building and it may even sound crazy to him if he's listening and he's probably going to think I'm nuts. But I think what he's going to come to is sign this Bill, make sure we've got an operational budget and call, and I hope he does, for a Special Session every day until we do RTA, CTA, Metra, capital, and yes, some form of health care. I think we have to come back and do all of this, but let's do our operational budget, which gives six hundred million new dollars (\$600,000,000) to education. Let's get that done and let the people of the State of Illinois know that they're all going to get their checks. We're all going to do capital, the CTA and the RTA will get done and within the next ten (10) to twelve (12) days it will all get done. Let's take this first step and vote 'yes'. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Davis, for what reason do you rise?"

Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman... Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this budget. First, I'd like to say I'm not

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

going to reiterate what has been stated by my colleagues. But we've had a number of meetings, we've had a number of caucuses. We've had a number of debates. We had to, at some point, reach a conclusion and the reason we had to do that is because number one, for our children. The children in the State of Illinois for the first time will receive an increase of four hundred dollars (\$400) per expenditure for elementary and secondary education. will be a 2 percent increase in every Illinois University's budget. There will be a 26.8 million dollar (\$26,800,000) increase in the MAP grant to assist those who are going to college. For the first time since 2003, we have an increase of a hundred fifty-five million dollars (\$155,000,000) for early childhood education. For those of us who want to wait until a budget is fashioned for the transportation system, you put our children and their education at risk. For those that want to wait for capital budget, you put our children's educational lives at risk. Are these other issues important? They are. But they, at this point, are not threatened with the shutdown. a budget that was very hard to come by and reach a consensus. I believe those who want to wait, perhaps they have not been here every single day. The budgeteers who worked long hours into the early morning in order to reach agreements that would be acceptable, and I commend them. I say to the people of Illinois and especially, especially, to the parents of children, who will have a school to go to and the doors will be open. Please accept this budget with all the hard work and the sweat and the tears with which it

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

was garnered and we will continue to work on those issues that have not been resolved, but we refuse to hold these children hostage and not let them go to school. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Mccarthy, for what reason do you rise?"

McCarthy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "He indicates he will."

McCarthy: "Representative Hannig, yesterday in our budget briefing we went over a few things about whether this is balanced or not balanced and you and I had some disagreement about the revenue projections. But sitting here today I'm very happy about the seven million dollars (\$7,000,000) that's going to go to the community colleges and can you tell me what was cut from yesterday's presentation in order to make that seven million (\$7,000,000) available?"

Hannig: "I think, Representative, that there was an opportunity with all the caucuses to have some input into the overall operations of this budget."

McCarthy: "Okay."

Hannig: "And some of the entities were rather quick in coming forward with some things and some were not and so this is a late addition by, I believe, the House Republicans."

McCarthy: "I certainly would say that the House Democrats certainly supported some increase for community colleges, too, but out budget briefing..."

Hannig: "We did, too. You're correct."

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

- McCarthy: "But my question was not that, my question was what did we take out in order to put that seven million (7,000,000) in?"
- Hannig: "So there... There was a number that the caucus had and it simply was subtracted from that number but the number was already accounted for. So, if I say to you..."
- McCarthy: "I don't know... You don't understand my question. My question is, we put seven million (7,000,000) in after our discussion yesterday for what we said was a balanced budget. So we put seven million (7,000,000) new in, for my way of accounting that means seven million (7,000,000) had to come out."
- Hannig: "So, the staff said that my... my... that I'm just not getting the point across. It's... I guess, it's suppose... suppose I would tell you that I'm holding ten dollars (\$10) here for you and you can spend it however you want. Well, eventually, you might come back and say I want to put five dollars (\$5) over here."
- McCarthy: "So there was a pool... there was a pool there of undesignated revenue, I guess you're saying?"
- Hannig: "Correct. There was a pool that..."
- McCarthy: "Also, in the 24 hours, there's been talk about a thousand (1,000) new positions for the AFSCME workers. Is that true?"
- Hannig: "It was... it was... it's the same issue, Representative.

 There was a certain amount of money that the Leaders were working with to allocate."
- McCarthy: "Well, my question is, what's the cost for that? Do you have an approximate?"

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

- Hannig: "It's about a twenty-five million dollar (\$25,000,000) program."
- McCarthy: "I'm sorry, but I think we were both talking at the same time and I couldn't hear you."
- Hannig: "Twenty-five million (25,000,000), roughly. It's a phase-in of about a thousand (1,000)."
- McCarthy: "Twenty-five million (25,000,000) okay. Is there any thing else that was added in the last 24 hours that you know of?"
- Hannig: "In the committee hearing that we had after our caucus, mentoring went up and early childhood went up... early childhood by five million (5,000,000)."
- McCarthy: "So, to the tune of how many dollars?"
- Hannig: "It went from... it was... it was at twenty (20) when we talked in our caucus and it was at twenty-five (25)."
- McCarthy: "It went the twenty-five (25), that was early childhood. And mentoring went from what to what?"
- Hannig: "Five (5) to twelve (12)."
- McCarthy: "Five (5) to twelve (12). Okay. So now we're at about I think thirty-nine or forty-four million dollars (\$39,000,000/\$44,000,000) and your position is that while we talked about this as a balanced budget during or briefing, this forty-four million (44,000,000) is coming out of some pot that was laying there unspent and for all of the priorities that we have in our caucus I can't believe that that is actual reality. It seems to me..."
- Hannig: "So the Leaders... I think in both sides, in all caucuses, recognized that when you have these caucuses and these discussions that pressures percolate up and some

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

times they have to deal with those pressures, so they set aside some money in anticipation of that and that's what we've seen."

- McCarthy: "So, the forty-four million (44,000,000) or what ever it was that was increased in the 24 hours, there was no revenue projections that were changed to..."
- Hannig: "No. So all we did was take money that would have been in a lump sum and reduce it and put it into these other lines."
- McCarthy: "Okay. Well, I'd like to know where that... that line is in the budget, where that lump sum stuff is that this money was taken out of that wasn't there before yesterday. Because as I told you yesterday, I have very serious questions about the revenue projections and to whether the balance... and to whether the budget is balanced or not. But I do want to say that everybody in here, almost everyone who has spoken has talked about the need for a capital plan and I strongly disagree with the notion that by putting this forward at this time that gets us closer to a capital plan. I may be wrong, but I think that this is getting us one step farther away from having a capital plan. I think we owe the people of the State of Illinois to move forward on that capital plan. I don't think that helps that and so therefore, I'll be voting against the budget today."
- Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Lake, Representative May, for what reason do you rise?"
- May: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield? Yes, Representative, yesterday when I asked in caucus about staffing at EPA and DNR, I was told there was no money for it, but now as part

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

of the… what Representative McCarthy mentioned, there are going to be new… money allocated for new staff in EPR… EPA and DNR. Is that correct?"

Hannig: "That's correct. So the phase-in would be for about twenty (20) front-line people at EPA and about forty-five (45) front-line people at Natural Resources, Representative."

May: "Okay. Thank you. I... I..."

Hannig: "So you... so your cries were heard."

May: "Yes, and many constituents have been concerned about the loss of front-line people: biologists, naturalists at DNR. So I think that this is a very positive step forward. I am pleased that we found a compromise that gives us more money for education and for Human Services without an income tax increase or a sales tax increase. I just want to point out, as I wear my green jacket today, one point that hasn't been mentioned and it is an increase of eleven million dollars (\$11,000,000) for OSLAD and NAAF. OSLAD went up 2.2 million (2,200,000) over last year to a total of thirty-four million (34,000,000) and the Natural Areas Acquisition Fund went up nine million (9,000,000) more from six million (6,000,000) last year to fifteen million (15,000,000). So, I thank all of the people who have fought for this and worked with this. I, too, hope that we get to a capital Bill to put a hundred million dollars (\$100,000,000) into our long-range increase in open space needs, but as we've said before this is a compromise. just wanted to point out the positive aspects for open space for our parks and for natural areas. Thank you."

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Jefferson, for what reason do you rise?"

Jefferson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I stand in support of the Bill. It certainly doesn't have ... certainly doesn't have everything I would like to see in the Bill as it relates to the community that I represent, but I think it's bigger than that. I think that we as Representatives need to move past our selfish motives and do what's best for the people we represent, that's why they sent us here, that's why I'm in support of this Bill. I certainly am disappointed that there isn't a capital program, but I think that we can work towards that in the end. You know that I just... recently we had to pass a referendum in Winnebago County so that we could repair our streets and roads. With this capital Bill, we can put people back to work and do a lot of other things. So, even though, I'm disappointed at this point, this Bill addresses a lot of the problems that we're having in the State of Illinois. We need to make sure we're doing the will of the people; that's why we're here, that's why they sent us here. think this budget addresses that situation for now. need to continue to work past this and do other things to make sure that we're addressing all the problems in the State of Illinois. Certainly, this is not a cure all for everything that we're confronted with, but it's a start in the right direction. So, I stand in support of this Bill. I would hope that we continue to work on a capital program, but I think we need to continue to do the work of the people. We can't afford to allow government to shutdown.

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

This is going to continue us to the future, give us an opportunity to work on the things that we need to work on. So I would encourage an 'aye' vote on this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from White, Representative Phelps, for what reason do you rise?"

Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to rise to the Bill. But first, my mom called a while ago and she's been watching this live over the Internet. She keeps seeing Gary up there as Representative Phelps, and I just want to tell her that I'm here, I'm safe and that I'm okay. said, 'My God, you have aged.' So I want just to tell her that I'm okay. To the Bill. Everyone knows I've been a huge advocate for more staffing in our state agencies and especially in our prisons. While eleven hundred (1,100) is great, I'm still going to stay with AFSCME, even though they may be for this, I think we ought to have more and that's why right now I can't support this budget. I'm for two thousand (2,000), actually, I'm for three thousand (3,000) but I know with our limitations. One of the most dangerous jobs to go to these days is a correctional officer, so we do every thing we do to protect their safety and that's why again, I won't be supporting this budget. Another reason I'm not going to support this budget is because there is, what Representative McCarthy said, there is not a capital component of this Bill and there's no guarantee of a capital Bill in this budget. You all know we haven't had a capital Bill in many, many years, and our working men and women need to go to work and they need to

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

know for sure they're going to make a living. So that's another reason for that. Also, I've talked to many of my IEA and IFT teachers and as you know, they're opposed to this as well, because there's not enough money for education and there is not a steady stream to fund our education for our future. Until these things fall into place, I hate to say this, but I will not be supporting this budget."

Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Champaign, Representative Jakobsson, for what reason do you rise?"

Jakobsson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill."

Speaker Turner: "To the Bill."

Jakobsson: "I support this Bill. I urge everyone to vote for I think it's really important when we are funding human services we're serving the people with special needs, the mentally ill, the developmental disabilities, the people who are victims of crime and violence. And also, very important is that we're increasing the funding to education, Pre-K through 12, seeing the foundation level going up. And in particular, higher education, a 2 percent increase to our universities, that's very important. I think we don't do enough for our universities, but increasing them by 2 percent is certainly very, very helpful. And I'd just like to remind people that, you know, this isn't just something that we do because the universities say, do it for us. These... or even the Pre-K through 12, these are investments that we're making to the people of the State of Illinois. Just yesterday there was a release from the National Science Board announcing that

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

the University of Illinois is getting over a two hundred million dollar (\$200,000,000) grant for a pediscale computer. Now some of us in this room might not quite know what a pediscale computer is, but it's one that is five hundreds more times more... times more powerful than today's typical super computer and those are very powerful. That's because of the investment that has been made to the University of Illinois to the national super computer... National Center for Super Computer Applications. So our investments in education pay off, we need to continue to invest in Pre-K through higher ed. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Patterson, for what reason do you speak?"

Patterson: "Mr. Speaker, I need some help determining how much has been allotted for paratransit in this budget."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "I'm told that it's 54.3 million (54,300,000).

Representative, it's 54.3 million (54,300,000)."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Can you hear me now? So, 54.3 million (54,300,000),

Representative."

Patterson: "Thank you very much, Representative."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Winters, the Gentleman from Winnebago."

Winters: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we've been engaged in an overtime Session that has now stretched on for seventy (70) days. I'd like to take you back several decades to a longer struggle. For three (3) years the British Empire stood alone against the Axis

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

Powers of Europe and in November of 1942, at the battle of the British had their first significant Alamein, victory. Winston Churchill said at that point, 'Now this is not the end. It is not even the beginning of the end. It is simply, perhaps, the end of the beginning.' We have a budget in front of us today, an operating budget, but this is not the end of the process. We still need Senate action, the Governor has to sign it, there may be even an override of a Gubernatorial Veto. This is a beginning of the end we hope, but we know it is the end of the beginning. We still need a capital projects Bill. We need that before us desperately. It's been eight (8) years since we had capital. Our bridges are, in fact, not in great shape. Our highways need help, our mass transit needs help, our inner city rail needs help. I simply ask the House to consider this is not the only thing that we need to do this summer. We do need to deal with the CTA, we do need to deal with a capital budget. This is not the end. Hopefully, it is the end of the beginning. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Hannig to close."

Hannig: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This is a balanced budget. It works off of the natural growth that we reasonably can expect to collect in FY '08, along with the loophole closure Bill that we passed in May. It does not rely on any fund sweeps or administrative chargebacks. It allows us to live within our means while addressing all the important issues that are beyond... in front of us. Education, front-line employees, pension, the

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

payment cycle, those are all favorably treated in this budget. So I would just simply say that while I would agree that there are other issues that remain to be debated in this Assembly before we can conclude, that it's important that we also understand that this issue, an operational budget, is probably the most important issue that we have to deal with today. It's just simply not fair that we should ask school districts, state employees, and providers to not know where their next check will be coming from. To not know when, if ever, the State of Illinois will pay them what is due. So this is the mechanism that we can provide that those people who are part of State Government and who allow State Government to do those things that we do so well, can be paid. So it allows... I would ask all Members of this House for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Turner: "So the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 3860?' All Members are reminded that they should vote their own switch and the Clerk will open the roll. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the roll. On this question, there are 99 voting 'yes', 9 voting 'no', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Speaker Madigan in the Chair."

Speaker Madigan: "All right, Ladies and Gentlemen, let me have your attention. Most of you know that there has been very unusual disagreement between the Office of the Speaker and the Office of the President of the Senate, very unusual that these happen nowadays. And you know that there has been some conversation about the fate of the Bill we just

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

passed. So, the latest word from the Senate is that they will take the Amendment, which was adopted to the Bill that just passed. They will offer that to another House Bill in the Senate today, pass that here today then we can concur on that Amendment, which means that the Bill goes to the Governor. It would be my deep wish, Mr. Black, that there could be a minimal of debate on the Motion to Concur. say that because the plan is to stay right here because we may be voting again on the budget... we hope to be voting again on the budget again today. In the meantime, we have a Bill to be called right now that's concerned with additional judgeships statewide. Tthe Bill known as the 7 percent Bill has passed the Senate, we'll take that committee... we'll take that to committee after we do the judges Bill and come back to the floor and do the 7 percent Bill. Does that sound good, John? So again, please stay around. Don't go away. And on page 9 of the Calendar, on the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, there appears Senate Bill 997. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 997, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. The Bill has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Cross, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Wait, on the Amendment."

Wait: "Thank you. I move for the adoption of Amendment #3."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk... Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill again?"

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

- Clerk Bolin: "Amendment #1 was Adopted in committee. Two Floor

 Amendments have been approved for consideration. Floor

 Amendments 3 and 4 have been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk... Mr. Clerk, relative to the committee Amendment, is there a Motion?"
- Clerk Bolin: "A Motion has been approved for consideration to table Committee Amendment #1."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, who is the Sponsor of the Motion?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Amendment #1 was sponsored by Representative Cross."
- Speaker Madigan: "And again, who is the Sponsor of the Motion?

 Did someone sign a slip for the Motion?"
- Clerk Bolin: "The Motion to Table committee Amendment #1 is signed by Representative Cross.
- Speaker Madigan: "Very good. Mr. Wait, on the Motion. Mr. Wait."
- Wait: "I move to table #1."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves to table Committee Amendment #1. Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 108 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. The Motion to Table committee Amendment #1 is adopted. Mr. Clerk, are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Cross, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Madigan: "Floor Amendment #3, Mr. Wait."
- Wait: "Yeah. I move to adopt Amendment #3, it simply adds three (3) judges statewide."

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves to adopt the Amendment.

Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The

Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Cross."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Wait."

Wait: "Yes, Amendment #4 is strictly a technical Amendment."

Speaker Madigan: The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #4. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further amendments?"

Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."

Speaker Madigan: "Put the Bill on the Order of Third Reading and read the Bill for a third time."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 997, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "On the Bill, Mr. Cross.

Cross: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is an agreed to Bill I believe by... and hopefully all... both chambers. It adds a number of judges throughout the state. I think the number is eight (8) and I would appreciate an 'aye' vote on it."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black."

Black: "Mr. Speaker, an inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Madigan: "State your inquiry."

Black: "House Rules state that we can't vote on any Bill that isn't on the system, this Bill is not on the system. What difference does it make. If we can vote on a fifteen hundred (1,500) page Bill in 2 hours, I'm not going to worry about it."

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

- Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'

 Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 108 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Supermajority Vote, is hereby declared passed. On page 9 of the Calendar on the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, there appears Senate Bill 513. Mr. Crespo. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 513, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. The Bill has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments #2, offered by Representative Crespo, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Crespo, on the Amendment."
- Crespo: "Yes, Speaker, as amended the Bill will extend the limits of the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District to include an area in Hoffman Estates where an outdoor entertainment venue is being constructed."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Put the Bill on the Order of Third Reading and read the Bill for a third time."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 513, a Bill for an Act concerning local Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Crespo."

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

Crespo: "Yes, thank you, Speaker. This came as a request by the Village of Hoffman Estates. As I said before, this basically extends the limits of the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District to include an area in Hoffman Estates where an outdoor venue is being constructed right now."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black."

Black: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Black: "Representative, what did you say the eight-acre parcel would be used for?"

Crespo: "It's for an outdoor entertainment venue."

Black: "Okay, in other words a concert venue?"

Crespo: "Correct."

Black: "What... what's the... I'm not familiar with the parcel obviously. How far away are homes and... you know, we had this problem down here years ago with Twitty City or Tweeter Center or whatever the heck it was. It's had more names than I can keep track of; people weren't happy with the noise. Is that going to be a similar situation with this parcel?"

Crespo: "Yes, Representative, actually this already went through the Zoning Board of Appeals and Planning Commission of Hoffman Estates and the residents had an opportunity to come to those meetings and there was no concerns at the time."

Black: "So, they would bring in entertaining and popular groups like Stark Naked and The Car Thieves, Mogan David and the Grapes of Wrath, Brylcreme and the Greasy Kids."

Crespo: "I wish I knew who those groups were."

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

Black: "Real bands that have amplifiers and can produce a hundred and fifty million (150,000,000) watts. So if the wind is right, maybe I can hear it in Danville?"

Crespo: "Well, I'm pretty sure, Representative, that was some of the issues that were discussed at the Zoning Board of Appeals and Planning Commission. In talking to the Mayor of Hoffman Estates and the village manager, those issues were addressed and were not a big concern."

Black: "So, it'll just be bands that mime? They won't really play, they'll just mime?"

Crespo: "No, you'll be able to hear the bands, but again it's...

Black: "Thank you."

Crespo: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Thank you. Will the speaker yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Sullivan: "Representative, the parcel in question you have planned to use, Hoffman Estates is going to turn it into this venue. Is this being annexed into Hoffman Estates or is it already incorporated into Hoffman Estates?"

Crespo: "It's already incorporated in Hoffman Estates."

Sullivan: "Is the development agreement already in place to develop this as a venue or could this development agreement change into homes and such?"

Crespo: "No, there's an agreement already in place."

Sullivan: "So, this is a signed agreement, it's already in place?"

Crespo: "Correct."

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

Sullivan: "There's no chance that this is going to change, potentially, into a community or some homes where residents might be taxed by the Water Reclamation District?"

Crespo: "Absolutely not."

Sullivan: "Okay, thank you."

Crespo: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'

Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 74 voting 'yes', 33 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Supermajority, is hereby... a Supermajority Vote, is hereby declared passed. On page 10 of the Calendar, there appears Senate Bill 1035. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of that Bill?"

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1035, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. The Bill has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."

Speaker Madigan: "Put the Bill on the Order of Third Reading and read the Bill for a third time."

Clerk: "Senate Bill 1035, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Soto."

Soto: "Yes. Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 1035 is a duplicate Bill of House Bill 1747 that passed out of this General Assembly and also passed out of the Senate and I urge an 'aye' vote."

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

Speaker Madigan: "The Lady moves for the passage of the Bill.

Those in favor... Mr. Black."

Black: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll try to be very brief.
Will the Sponsor yield?"

Soto: "Yes."

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

"Representative, I have no empathy or sympathy for Black: deadbeat parents who don't pay their child support. only thing that concerns me about this, if you provide for vehicle impoundment then one of the biggest problems in collecting child support is getting that person to go to And I know all of the things they try, cash payments, false names, different Social Security numbers, but it would seem to me that your Bill may be counter productive. If you impound that person who is not paying child support's vehicle then the individual may not be able to get to work. Because, you know, the CTA may shutdown and be sold for scrap. I don't know. In my district we don't have a CTA and if the noncustodial parent doesn't have a vehicle to get to work, there's no other way for him to get to work. So I would think it would compound the problem of not making child support payments."

Soto: "Well, it would be authorized by the municipality, they would have an input if the vehicle should be impounded. So it would be on their decision. It doesn't just happen, it has to be an agreement."

Black: "And that brings up my... And I understand that, I know you've worked hard on the Bill. But municipalities, I don't believe have any real idea how difficult child

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

support is and how hard the people work here in DHS to get that money. To a municipality, it may seem very simple, you owe child support I'm going to impound our car. It really isn't that simple. I think your Bill will pass. I just... my office, 50 percent of our cases are child support, and in a small community that might think this is a great idea, DHS may not... you know, DHS would probably say, now be careful, because if you can't get to work, we can't collect child support. So it's certainly nothing personal, it's nothing political, I've just had child support cases for years and years and years and I can't support this Bill."

Soto: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Lang."

Lang: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Lang: "Thank you. Representative, let me help you out a little and to clarify for Mr. Black. As I understand your Bill, if when a person gets their notice that their license might be suspended if they come in and make a payment arrangement then they don't suspend the license. Is that correct?"

Soto: "That is correct, Representative."

Lang: "So nobody is going to lose their license if they make a payment arrangement?"

Soto: "That's correct."

Lang: "And the point... the whole point of the Bill is to say to a person, you're not going to make any money for yourself if you don't take care of your kids. Is that correct?"

Soto: "That is correct."

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

Lang: "All right. So you get this notice and then you discover that you can go in and make a payment arrangement and then the problem goes away. Is that right?"

Soto: "Yes."

Lang: "So, this is just a tool for the department to put over the head of these folks to say come in and make a payment arrangement and we won't take your vehicle from you or we won't take your license from you."

Soto: "Correct."

Lang: "All right. So that ought to respond to Mr. Black's question. Nobody's going to lose their license if they're going to pay. The only problem is if you don't pay and if you don't pay, you shouldn't be... if your kid's not going to get any money, you shouldn't either, it seems to me. So thank you, Representative."

Soto: "Thank you. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "For what purpose does Mr. Black seek recognition?"

Black: "Mr. Speaker, in all do respect to my good friend Mr. Lang. We're not talking about a driver's license suspension; we're talking about vehicle impoundment. Most of the deadbeat parents in my district haven't had a driver's license in twenty (20) years and that doesn't bother them, but it'll bother them if you impound their vehicle, and I think it will be counterproductive."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Mulligan. Mulligan."

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a problem with this Bill and the same thing as Representative Black does, but for a different vein. Many times a couple will own a car

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

and they may both use it to go to work. So why should a spouse be victimized or lose her job or his job if one is not paying child support? I mean, there is something about this that I just don't get. And I think the bottom line is we've always kind of taken a dim view of keeping someone from actually working by taking away their transportation or doing whatever. The object is for them to work and pay. And there are many things that both the Federal Law has put into place and the State Law has put into place that says you can go after, you can go in, you can go after the withholding, you can go in and garnish their wages, but if you take away their car and they can't get to work... go to work or they take away a car that is owned jointly in a family and they're penalizing the other person in that family it really isn't, I don't think, a wise thing to do. And I don't care if the department supports it or what they do, we've always gone with that route that we try to keep people given the ability to work and there are other avenues to go including garnishing their wages."

Soto: "Okay, I have something to add to that. I know that in the… a few months back I passed the House Bill and I had a lot of input and a lot of our colleagues here participated in crafting this Bill. So there has been opportunity that if you were against this Bill that you had the opportunity to have some input. I'm just putting that out…"

Mulligan: "I did have the opportunity, I voted 'no' the last time. I thought that was a good input."

Soto: "Okay, thank you."

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

Mulligan: "And I think I spoke against it also for the same reason and I think I've worked with child support and domestic violence and other things for a number of years."

Soto: "And you have and I appreciate it."

Mulligan: "So, I've always... but the main thing that we've always objected to is keeping people from working because the goal is to pay the money."

Soto: "Okay. Okay. Can I ask you a question?"

Mulligan: "Yes."

Soto: "So does it go... do you support that if a car is impounded from someone that's been driving under the influence, do you... are you thinking... are you... do you feel the same way you do about this Bill? That the spousal both the..."

Mulligan: "No, I don't."

Soto: "Okay, so why are you against this Bill?

Mulligan: "Because there is a difference when you are drunk and you are driving, you're liable to hit somebody and kill them. There's a difference in this. The difference is you're taking away the ability for them ultimately to pay the money and the goal isn't to impound the car, the goal is to get them to pay. And so my problem with that is how do they pay if they can't work?"

Soto: "Do you have any idea for maybe further legislation that maybe would address your concern?"

Mulligan: "Right. I passed the law that said you would have to be able to track nationally where you work and how to garnish the wages. I did that maybe ten (10) years ago when the Federal Government gave us that ability to track through banking accounts, to track through Social Security

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

numbers, there is multiple ways you can get control of the The bottom line is, and I'm not disagreeing with the fact that you have a noble motive in doing this, what I'm disagreeing with is the ultimate thought that you're keeping them from earning the money you want them to pay. And I just don't... I've never gotten the... that... I don't understand that. My understanding is get them to work, get them to pay if you want, garnish the wages. But if you impound the car... usually to impound a car it costs you quite a bit just to get it out. So who's going to do it for free? So, if you have to go and pay a hundred dollars (\$100) to get your car unimpounded, that's a hundred dollars (\$100) less that's going to child support, then you have to put something on the child support to get the car out. I just don't understand the premise, I think it's faulty."

- Soto: "While I look forward to working with you, maybe you won't support this Bill this time, but maybe we can get together and work on something that maybe we can both agree on."
- Mulligan: "That's fine, Representative, you get the Bill passed and you do it and you think it's right, I think it's wrong. I think the premise is basically wrong."
- Soto: "And that's fine, but you know what if you have any idea,

 I look forward to working with you maybe on a Bill that we
 can both agree on."
- Mulligan: "Representative, I told you the avenues there were because I passed the legislation years ago and there are

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

many avenues. If the department can't figure that out, that's their problem."

Soto: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Lindner."

Lindner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Lindner: "I'm looking at your section on vehicle impoundment and it looks very confusing. I don't exactly understand how this is going to work and if each municipality is going to draft their own ordinance and do this their own way or can you tell me exactly how this is going to work?"

Soto: "Yes, it will be... it... there will be a conversation through the health... Health Care and Family Services and they will draft their own language on this."

Lindner: "Each... each village and city will draft their own language as to how to do this?"

Soto: "Municipality... May provide by ordinance."

Lindner: "Okay, so there's... you're really not providing a State

Law as to how everyone would do this in the state? It's

village by village or city by city, they can do what they

want?"

Soto: "Okay. It's clear... it's upon certification of the department."

Lindner: "Okay, but what... so the department, what do they do contact the village or contact the city first and say somebody hasn't paid child support or how does the village find this out?"

Soto: "They find out through the Department of Health Care and Family Services State Disbursement Unit that they are not

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

paying and that there can be a... it could be that they can get their car impounded. So they are warned... they are warned that they are not paying their child support and there may... they may have their car impounded."

Lindner: "Okay, so then if they don't pay..."

Soto: "So they are warned, they are warned."

Lindner: "Yeah. The person is warned who owes the child support. Okay, I understand that. But then what happens? The department contacts the village or the city or what do they do?"

Soto: "The village or the city that they're in."

Lindner: "And then what if they..."

Soto: "And then they have ample time to get back to the Health Care and try to work something out, a payment plan. So they do get an opportunity. So it's not like they just go out and say you're not... you're not notified saying you're going to get you're car impounded. They say you have an opportunity to come in and make it right and work it out."

Lindner: "Does this just give the city or village the authority to do it, you're not saying they have to do it?"

Soto: "We're not saying the have to do it, they may adopt an ordinance."

Lindner: "They may adopt an ordinance. And then... and then is it the responsibility of the city to contact then the Department of Health and Human Services to find out whether a payment has been made? I just want to know the process. I don't... it seems like a very confusing process."

Soto: "Upon certification. Upon certification... so they can try to work it out. They will be notified and if they don't

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

respond, ya know, then of course they would have their car impounded, but if they do respond they can work a payment plan out. The custodial parent has rights, too, and that's what we're trying to do. We're trying to make it clear and also make it fair that if a noncustodial parent... we don't want to just go after a noncustodial parent, that's not the way... I mean, you've been working on child support, you know how this is done. We've never gone after a noncustodial parent and try to attack them. We're trying to make it fair. We want them to pay, because if we don't work along with them we're not going to see... we're not going to see the child support payments."

- Lindner: "Okay, but whose responsibility is it to let the city know that the child support has been paid so that they don't impound the car and have to pay the extra fee like Representative Mulligan was talking about?"
- Soto: "Okay, so, well, they will have... they will have conversation. Health Care and Family Services can reach out to the city and the city... I mean it's like any thing any department, we can reach out to them and they also reach out to us."
- Lindner: "But I guess... I think this is a very unwieldy plan because of each city or village has its own ordinance, how do we know what that ordinance says and what their responsibility is to the department, and what the department's responsibility is to them?"
- Soto: "You know what, they're all different and I don't know...

 you know, we're hoping that they'll do the best to this
 Bill."

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

Lindner: "Yeah. I think this Bill needs more work before we vote. I would vote a 'no' vote."

Soto: "Well, I look forward to working with you, too, on future child support Bills."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Eddy."

Eddy: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Eddy: "Representative, House Bill 1747 is a Bill that was passed out of here that is similar to this."

Soto: "It's the duplicate. It was held in Rules, it was a little late so they had to then put it on a shell Bill..."

Eddy: Is this an exact duplicate of that Bill?"

Soto: "Exactly, it's the exact Bill, just shelled and put into...

I mean stripped and put into a shell Bill."

Eddy: "Okay. So there aren't any changes in it that would... for example, if someone was not in favor of the Bill... underlying Bill of 1747, they probably would have the same objections to this Bill?"

Soto: "You have my word that it is the exact Bill."

Eddy: "Okay, thank you very much."

Soto: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'

Those in favor... Representative Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank you very much. To the Bill. I just was standing in support of the Bill because for years we have worked on the issue of child support in the State of Illinois. Representative Hamos and Lyons and I worked on that Bill four (4) years ago. They have admitted now the collection rate in the State of Illinois was only 21

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

percent. That means that only 21 percent of people receiving any collection. We have now moved that up to 50 percent, but that is where Representative Soto's and the department is working towards so that's why I'm in support of the Bill that anything that will increase the rate for the people... the women and children, and I know there are some men, but 99 percent are the women and children in the State of Illinois that are not receiving collection. I think this is something that the agency is in strong support of that's why Representative Soto did this Bill, and I think that this is done in a lot of other states and that's what they have modeled it after. Thank you."

- Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall the Bill pass?'
 Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Kosel. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 78 voting 'yes', 24 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Supermajority vote, is hereby declared passed.

 Mr. Clerk. Mr. Clerk... Mr. Clerk on Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk Bolin: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 657, offered by Representative Granberg. House Resolution 658, offered by Representative Younge. And House Resolution 659, offered by Representative Reboletti."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Clerk has read the Agreed Resolutions.

 Representative Currie moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Mr. Clerk, committee announcements."

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

- Clerk Bolin: "The following committees will meet immediately: Elections and Campaign Reform in 122B; Elementary and Secondary Education in Room C-1; Electric Utility Oversight in Room D-1; and Revenue in Room 118."
- Speaker Madigan: "You've all heard the committee announcements. Ladies and Gentlemen, the plan is to stand in recess until 4:00, 4:00. The plan is to come back into Session at 4 and to be prepared to vote on the 7 percent Bill and hopefully, on a Motion to Concur on the budget from the Senate. So again, please stay in Springfield and be prepared to vote again. And we'll see all of you about 4:00 this afternoon. Thank you."
- Speaker Madigan: "Ladies and Gentlemen, let me give you a First, let me apologize for the delay, let me apologize for keeping all of you standing at ease for the majority of the day. You may recall earlier in the day, I told all of you that we expected that the Senate would offer the same Amendment that we considered this morning to a different House Bill, pass that Bill tonight or today and put us in a position to concur in that Amendment sometime today. There has been no communication today to me from the office of the Senate President. What I can tell you are things that you have probably have heard from others that there is a report that the Senate plans to go to committee tonight, possibly to consider a gaming Bill. They have revised the budget so that the budget Amendment that we voted on today has been changed. The revised budget Amendment has not yet been filed, so we don't know what's in the Amendment. It would take us a minimum of 2

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

hours to review a revised budget Amendment and with all of that in mind, why... the plan is that we would adjourn now and come back here at 10:00 in the morning. That'll give our staff an opportunity to review an Amendment that would be filed in the Senate tonight and be able to advise us in the morning as to what changes were made in the Amendment. Some of you may have questions. Mr. Joyce?"

- Joyce: "Mr. Speaker, what's the intention with the 7 percent Bill? You said you were going to call that."
- Speaker Madigan: "We'll do that in the morning, we're for the 7 percent, despite published reports to the contrary."
- Joyce: "I understand that, but we're going to do that regardless of what the status of the budget Bill is?"
- Speaker Madigan: "Can I get back with you on that? Mr. Fritchey."
- Fritchey: "Thank you, Speaker. Just from a scheduling standpoint, so if we would convene tomorrow at 10... am I right in assuming that there would be new committee hearings on whatever changes may come over from the Senate as well as at that point potentially a capital/gaming Bill. The reason I ask is, ya know, it may make a difference for those of us that may try to at least go home for the night whether we need to be here at 10:00 sharp or if perhaps Session in substance wouldn't start until 11:00 or 12:00 or beyond."
- Speaker Madigan: "Let me say this, the representations to Tim Mapes from Joel Rock has been that the Senate changes are technical in nature. We haven't seen the Amendment so we don't know. Now if they're technical in nature, why, we

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

could just come right to the floor there would be no need for committee. But since there has been no communications all day, we don't know what changes have been made in the budget Amendment and we're required to wait to see what the changes are."

Fritchey: "Is there any plan then with respect to anything else that the Senate may send over?"

Speaker Madigan: "I'm told that they will consider the Bill to raise the cigarette tax and our expectation is that they're going to attempt to... they will call a Bill that deals with casinos; it would be additional positions at the existing casinos and the casino in Chicago. Let me add that representatives of the City of Chicago now are advising Senators that they are against the Bill. So the host city is against the Bill. All right. So, Representative Currie moves that the House stand adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. See you at 10:00 in the morning."

Clerk Mahoney: "The House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Committee Reports. Representative John Bradley, Chairperson from the Committee on Revenue, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on August 09, 2007, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'recommends be adopted' is a Motion to Concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 664. Representative Smith, Chairperson from the Committee on Elementary & Secondary Education, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on August 09, 2007, reported the same back with the following

114th Legislative Day

8/9/2007

recommendation/s: 'recommends be adopted' is Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 671. Representative Nekritz, Chairperson from the Committee on Elections & Campaign Reform, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on August 09, 2007, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'recommends adopted' Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 662. Representative Scully, Chairperson from the Committee on Electric Utility Oversight, to which the measure/s was/were referred, action taken on August 09, 2007, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'recommends be adopted' is Floor Amendment #4 and Floor Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 1299. Introduction and reading of House Bills-First Reading. House Bill 4128, offered by Representative Saviano, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 4129, offered by Representative Mautino, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Referred to the House Committee on Senate Joint Resolution 55, offered Rules is by Representative Bill Mitchell. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will adjourned."